

CITY of BAKERSFIELD:
Fairway Oaks: Single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name:</i>	Fairway Oaks
<i>Project Location:</i>	in southwest quadrant of Brimhall Road and Calloway Drive north of Cal State University Bakersfield in west Bakersfield at edge of city
<i>Developer:</i>	Burlington Homes / BHA Properties LLC 6851 McDivitt Drive, Ste. B, Bakersfield California 93313 805 836 2996
<i>Owner:</i>	Same
<i>Project Components:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-241 residential lots, 1 sump lot, 1 school lot on 76.85 acres-sump lot @ 1.08 acres-school lot @ 10.2 acres-241 residential lots on 65.57 acres = 3.71 du/ac-project in 3 marketing phases<ul style="list-style-type: none">-phase 1: 96 residential lots + 1 sump lot-phase 2: 84 residential lots + 1 school lot-phase 3: 61 residential lots-lot sizes range from 6529 sf - 15644 sf; typical lot size 7000 sf-no community amenities or recreation centers on site-one housing series with 5 floor plans + flex options<ul style="list-style-type: none">-plan 1: 3 bdrm / 2 ba / 2 car garage @ 1407 sf-plan 2: 4 bdrm / 2 ba / 2 car garage @ 1650 sf-plan 3: 4 bdrm / 2 ba / 2-3 car garage @ 1900 sf-plan 4: 4 bdrm / 2 ba / 3 car garage @ 2200 sf-plan 5: 5 bdrm / 3 ba / 2-3 car garage @ 2505 sf-Price Range: \$102,990 - \$ 149,990-all one story, except for 2 story Plan 5 model
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APNs: 500-010-22, -16 Tentative Tract Map: 5869 Zone Changes: 96-0521, 96-0287, 96-0286
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Sequoia Engineering, Inc. / Smithtech USA

Project Description:

This housing subdivision is located in a peripheral area of west Bakersfield. The area is undergoing transformation from a predominantly agricultural area dotted with oil wells to a district dominated by internally focused subdivisions. To the west of the project site is Verdugo Lane and a single family subdivision; to the east is an undeveloped commercial site on Kern County land and another single family subdivision; to the north is county land across Brimhall Road; to the southeast is Calloway Drive and single family residential uses; to the south is the future freeway alignment. The topography of the site is flat—but does not pose serious flooding or drainage problems due to the close proximity of the Kern River south of the project site.

California Department Housing and Community Development

The project site is roughly a right triangle in shape with the hypotenuse curving along Calloway Drive. A rectangular 10.2 acre school site has been located centrally along the western border at Verdugo Lane. The sump site is located in the furthest southwest corner of the site. The project has three vehicular access points: 2 at Brimhall Road, and a primary entry at Calloway Drive to the southeast. The street layout is composed primarily of cul-de-sacs across the site, with no direct throughways across the site. The lots are deep and narrow, which will result in garage dominant house plans.

The model center for this project is located at the Calloway Drive entrance at Marby Grange Way. The houses are designed in a contemporary suburban style with Mediterranean overtones. They are finished with stucco plaster, concrete tile roofs, aluminum sliding windows, inoperable wood shutters and fascias, built-up foam and stucco plaster trim, arches, decorative columns, and roll up garage doors. The front doors are set back from the street and tucked behind the garages. The front facades are highly detailed, the other three sides are more austere. Despite the name of the subdivision, there is no golf course on the site, nor are there any oaks. A golf course is planned for a nearby subdivision at a later time.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project required only a few approvals: a tract map, and several zone changes. The project required 3 zone changes from Agricultural and Residential Suburban uses to a consolidated R-1 single family residential zone.

Prior to development the flat land was vacant and used for alfalfa production. Two oil wells were recorded on the site during the 1930s. The Department of Conservation required that these wells be re-abandoned and no structures be constructed in close proximity to the capped well heads. During the site inspection however, the wells could not be located. Since the well heads were not discovered, the developer was not bound to any setback or structure limitations.

Two water well sites are to be designated on the project site to contribute to municipal water resources. One of the wells will be located within the first phase of construction. The city will determine the location of the second well later in the construction process.

Environmental analysis for the project was covered in the certification of an EIR for the larger community area South of Brimhall Road, which included this project site. The project itself received a Mitigated Negative Declaration. Only a few moderate environmental impacts arose with this project, including: air quality, biological resources, traffic, cultural resources, and schools.

The project required review by Cal Trans due to proximity to a future freeway alignment.

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers and agencies were minimal and provided for few project additions. The Planning Department included various requirements in the conditions of approval. These conditions are detailed below.

The project was assessed a number of development impact fees, including: Phase II regional traffic impact fees @ \$2197 per single family unit, sewer and water connections fees, plan checking fees, habitat conservation fees at \$1240 per acre; Kern High School District fees of \$1.93/ sf + development impact fees, annexation of the project into Community Facilities District 92-1 and required fees, annexation into the Rosedale Union School District with various school district fees, and a park land dedication fee, among others.

California Department Housing and Community Development

The Applicant requested modifications of city development standards on a number of site plan conditions, including: cul-de-sac configurations, minimum lot frontages, block length limitations and minimum corner lot frontages. Rather than proceed with these code modifications, the project Engineer revised the site plan to avoid some of these deviations. In the process of revision, the number of lots was decreased to better address municipal development standards. This was the only lot reduction in the approvals process. The public agencies did not request any lot reductions.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

6 Mar 97	Title Report and Insurance from American Title Co;
17 Mar 97	Planning Commission meeting: project discussed and one zone change approved;
21 Mar 97	Applications for project submitted: request for project phasing; filing fee of \$2280 paid; original application for 248 lots;
21 Mar 97	Indemnification Agreement submitted by Applicant;
21 Mar 97	Tentative Tract Map submitted;
21 Mar 97	Applicant letter to Planning Department – re: letter of agency for Engineer to act on behalf of Burlington Homes;
21 Mar 97	Environmental Information Form submitted by Applicant: impacts noted to municipal service demand and water resources;
21 Mar 97	Mineral Rights Waiver of Surface Entry Rights provided to the City of Bakersfield;
25 Mar 97	Project review check list by Planning Department;
27 Mar 97	Planning Department letter to Engineer – re: notification of incomplete application; site plan issues still exist; will-serve letter for water service provision required; Rights of Way dedications required; secondary vehicular access required for each phase of the development; an additional fee of \$562 is required to process the block length modification;
1 Apr 97	Planning Department letter to Engineer – re: sound wall required at Calloway Drive;
1 Apr 97	Will-serve letter from City of Bakersfield water superintendent;
4 Apr 97	Rosedale Unified School District letter to Public Works Department – re: school site size is adequate;
9 Apr 97	Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: access to school site meets school district standards, despite concern of City Traffic Engineer;
9 Apr 97	Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: deviations from municipal design standards requested for cul-de-sacs, lot frontage, long block and corner lot frontage;
9 Apr 97	Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: corrections made to incomplete project application;
9 Apr 97	Applicant letter to Planning Department – re: request to deviate from municipal standards for 1000' block;
17 Apr 97	Project routed to agencies for comment;
22 Apr 97	Office of Environmental Services comments: restrictions and conditions with regard to oil wells; development standards vis-a-vis new construction in proximity to oil wells included;
25 Apr 97	Water Resources Department comments: on-lot wells prohibited from exporting water off the site—okay for on-site use;
29 Apr 97	California Department of Conservation - Division of Oil, Gas & Geothermal Resources comments: 2 wells on site; no structures or streets allowed over abandoned oil wells; re-abandonment operations required of developer;
May 97	Fire Department comments: standard conditions;
2 May 97	State Department of Transportation comments: minor comments, project okay;
2 May 97	Public Works Department memo to Planning Department – re: fee schedule and requirement for Cal Trans regional impact fees;
5 May 97	Initial Study for Environmental Assessment by Planning Department: Mitigated Negative Declaration recommended; no significant impacts noted; several potential impacts noted, including: air quality, biological resources, traffic, cultural resources, schools; project to be tiered off new EIR;

California Department Housing and Community Development

6 May 97 Planning Department letter to Cal Trans – re: city has traffic impact and capital improvement mitigation policies in place already;

7 May 97 City Council meeting: South of Brimhall Road EIR certified; no significant impacts noted; Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for this project however; zone changes discussed; continued to next meeting;

13 May 97 Revised Tentative Tract Map submitted;

19 May 97 Public Works Department comments: several conditions forwarded, including: deceleration lanes at Brimhall and Calloway, street improvements to adjacent arterials, medians and traffic signal required at Calloway Drive, construction of Verdugo Lane required, bus turnouts required,

9 May 97 Notice of Public Hearing;

12 May 97 North Bakersfield Recreation and Park District comments: none;

13 May 97 Planning Department comments: Habitat Conservation fees required; street name approvals; sound wall required;

13 May 97 PG&E comments: 10' lot easements required;

14 May 97 Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: revisions to project layout; lots eliminated at cul-de-sacs to avoid deviations from lot frontage standards; major redesign of project's first phase; project now only deviates from city development standards with regard to the 1000' long block;

14 May 97 Planning Department memo to Water Resources Department – re: comments on well location;

16 May 97 Recreation and Park District memo to Planning Department – re: landscape and maintenance issues discussed for Calloway Drive and Freeway;

16 May 97 Parks Department comments: conditions include: walls and landscaping required on double frontage lots, landscaping required on all non-residential lots and the sump well lot, landscape and irrigation plan required for full project;

21 Mar 97 Applicant signs Agreement to Mitigation Measures Form;

22 May 97 Staff Report to Planning Commission: 5 mitigation measures included; 23 conditions of approval;

2 June 97 Planning Commission meeting: continued to next meeting of 5 June 97;

3 June 97 Department of Conservation site inspection; excavation of large area to locate oil well heads fails to locate them;

3 June 97 Planning Department memo to Planning Commission – re: addition of 2 conditions of approval for school district mitigations and fees;

5 June 97 Planning Commission meeting: project approved; 25 conditions of approval, including: extensive construction mitigations for air pollution controls, solar low-e water heaters, central water heating systems, double-paned windows, low-sodium parking lot lights, annexation of the site to the consolidated maintenance district with annual payments by the owner, Kern High School District fees of \$1.93/ sf + development impact fees, annexation of the project into Community Facilities District 92-1, annexation into the Rosedale Union School District with various school district fees, and a park land dedication fee based on acreage and population; 2 neighbors speak in opposition to the project with regard to the small lot sizes—an existing neighborhood to the west has 9000 sf - 13000 sf lots—request for lot size increase; Commission has concerns over the speed of through traffic—and respected the traffic calming effects of cul-de-sacs;

6 June 97 Notice of Determination prepared: Mitigated Negative Declaration; filed with county clerk;

6 June 97 De Minimus Impact Finding and certificate of exemption from California Department of Fish and Game fees;

9 June 97 Notice of Determination filed with county clerk;

11 June 97 City Council meeting: Zone changes approved with findings;

21 June 97 City Council meeting: second reading of zone changes; project effective;

27 June 97 Planning Department memo to file – re: abandoned oil wells cannot be located; Do structural setbacks still apply? the wildcatters in the 1930s removed the casings at the time of abandonment, so there is no surface indication of these wells;

California Department Housing and Community Development

22 July 97	Building Department comments: soils report required;
2 Oct 97	Department of Conservation comments: notification of site inspection findings;
24 Nov 97	San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District comments: mitigations and procedures outlined;
1 Dec 97	Appraisal Report to determine park in-lieu fees;
12 Jan 98	Real Estate Appraiser letter to Planning Department – re: preliminary appraisal of property;
13 Jan 98	Planning Department letter to Real Estate Appraiser – re: city needs a more complete appraisal;
26 Jan 98	Planning Department memo to City Property Manager – re: appraisal issues for park in-lieu fees;
28 Jan 98	Planning Department memo to North Bakersfield Recreation and Parks District – re: fee calculation form for in-lieu fees;
29 Jan 98	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: preliminary appraisal not acceptable; full appraisal required;
11 Feb 98	North Bakersfield Recreation and Park District letter to Applicant – re: \$21,900 in-lieu fee required; based on calculation and property appraisal: 241 lots x .0076 acres/lot = \$1.83 park acreage dedication required x \$12000 in-lieu rate = \$21,900;
28 Feb 98	Department of Conservation comments: none;
1 May 98	Building plans submitted for pre-mastered Building Permit plan check;
8 May 98	Plan Check complete for pre-mastered models;
21 May 98	Building Permit Application: house @ 815 Augusta Hills Drive; clone application;
21 May 98	Building Permit Issued for house @ 815 Augusta Hills Drive;
13 Aug 98	Building Permit Finaled for house @ 815 Augusta Hills Drive;
15 Sept 98	Planning Department letter to Engineer – re: approval of lot reduction;
16 Sept 98	Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: reduction of 6 lots at the cul-de-sacs;

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	21 Mar 1997 - 21 June 1997 = 3 months
Building Permit Approvals (pre-mastered):	1 May 1998 - 8 May 1998 = .25 months
Building Construction Period - typical house:	21 May 1998 - 13 Aug 1998 = 3.75 months
Building Construction Period:	8 May 1998 - Aug 1998, continuing

Public Participation / Opposition:

Minor opposition to the project was voiced by two neighbors of the project. They requested an increase in the lot size to better match existing single family subdivisions in the area.

CITY of BRENTWOOD:
Town Square: single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name:</i>	Town Square
<i>Project Location:</i>	North of San Jose Avenue / West of Fairview Avenue in west Brentwood in Special Planning Area D
<i>Developer:</i>	Greystone Homes, Inc. 6601 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 100 Pleasanton, California 94566 510 417 0150
<i>Owner:</i>	Greystone Homes, Inc. (above) with Vasco Group, LP 2800 W. March Lane #330 Stockton, California 95219
<i>Project Components:</i>	<p>Planned Community: 21 parcels each with distinct zoning: -commercial, office, various residential density subdivisions, & 4 open space parcels -1250 residential units on 292.2 acres = 4.3 units/gross acre -in Sand Creek Special Planning Area "D".</p> <p>Town Square Subdivision: 3 phase development -phase I = 107 units; phase II = 110 units; phase III = 75 units -292 units on 63.5 acres = 4.6 units/gross acre -lot sizes phase I & II = 4000 sf - 6000 sf; phase III = 7000 sf -5 house plans each with 3 elevations -each with a 3 car garage, and 2 stories (except as noted) plan 1 = 4 br / 3 ba @ 1914 sf plan 2 = 4 br / 3 ba @ 2086 sf plan 3 = 5 br / 3 ba @ 2228 sf plan 4 = 4 br / 2 ba @ 1816 sf, single story plan 5 = 5 br / 4 ba @ 2900 sf -lot coverage max @ 20%; paving max @ 30% of lot -max height 35 ft and 2 stories</p>
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APNs: 054-160-12, -13, -19, -20, -22 Rezone: RZ 94-2 Tentative Map: TM 7948 and TM 7948A
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: MacKay & Somps

Project Description:

This planned community of commercial uses and 1250 residential lots on 292.2 acres is located in west Brentwood on land previously utilized for agricultural use. The overall community combines the land of many different owners and redistributes these parcels to distinctly zoned areas. Two five acre neighborhood parks are located in

California Department Housing and Community Development

the development, as well as a 12 acre flood control basin, and a 14 acre community park. 56 acres of commercial development are located to the west end of the community adjacent to the proposed State Route 4 Bypass. The rest of the community is designated for various high-, medium-, and low-density residential densities on distinct subdivision parcels. There are no mixed use parcels in the development. Sand Creek road will ultimately bisect the community from east to west with subdivisions to either side. Some larger lot residential uses are located adjacent to the community. The land is subject to easements for irrigation canals, ingress and egress to adjacent parcels.

The first subdivision in the community (Town Square) consists of 3 phases on 3 parcels in the southeast corner of the community. The subdivision is an indistinct combination of loop road and internal cul-de-sac tracts ranging from 4000 sf - 7000 sf minimum lot sizes. Five house plans each with various elevations are offered by the developer. A loose American vernacular architectural theme has been noted by the developer. Each house has a front porch and a three-car garage. The house facades are composed of stucco, hardboard siding, and spot masonry details, some with inoperable wood shutters. The other three sides of each house are flat stucco. The houses have vinyl windows and composition asphalt shingle roofs. A paint scheme of earth tones with contrasting color details provides nine options for the buyer.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project required a rezone from agricultural use to various commercial and residential uses. Prior to development the land required close-out and environmental clean-up of several oil well sites in Special Planning Area "D". A new tentative map voided one previous tentative map in the area. A second tentative map expired on its own due to lack of development. For drainage purposes, the engineering staff required a flood retention basin @ 10 - 18 ft below existing grade to hold potential run-offs of up to 105 acre feet.

Key Project Adjustments:

The city required the developer to provide roadway and landscape improvements to adjacent off-site collector roads and a theme wall (sound wall) at the exterior boundaries of the community. The city also required the widening of some internal roads for consistency with the General Plan and increased landscaping and median strip development. The regional irrigation district required irrigation canals traversing the community to be fenced by the developer to prevent residents from accessing potentially pesticide contaminated water. The Planning Commission required roll-up garage doors, extensive public roadway improvements, lot and project fencing, and the installation of a traffic light. After approval of the tentative map, an amendment was made to change the lot count to bring Phase I up to 107 units rather than the approved 106 units and to adjust Phase III to 75 units on 7000 sf lots rather than 61 on 8000 sf lots.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

1 June 94	Universal Planning Application submitted with fee of \$16,530 for approval of Planned Development (PD-6);
30 Aug 94	Planning Commission Study Session;
1 Nov 94	Meeting to work out project details with staff and applicant. Zoning designations vis-à-vis specific parcels adjusted and the proposed neighborhood commercial designation was eliminated;
15 Nov 94	Planning Commission Meeting to hear rezoning RZ-94-2, and Planned Development permit PD-6. Rezone exempt under CEQA regulations due to conformance with General Plan. 13 conditions of approval adopted. New development standards adopted for PD-6. Unanimous approval of project received in Resolution No. 94-53; Subsequent City Council approval of the rezone and planned development permit;
23 Dec 94	Land acquired by developer;

California Department Housing and Community Development

10 Jan 95	Meeting of the East Contra Costa Irrigation District--they decide that adjacent irrigation canals must be fenced;
11 Jan 95	First subdivision Universal Application for Tentative Map filed with fee of \$21, 850: File # TSM-7948. Includes 3 phases of 278 units;
11 Jan 95	Planning Department seeks comments from agencies on project;
14 Mar 95	CEQA Initial Study completed by staff--project receives Mitigated Negative Declaration with impacts noted in the following areas: water absorption rates, increased traffic, poor emergency access, cultural resources, increases in public service levels and utility demand;
15 Mar 95	Public Hearing Notice;
4 Apr 95	Mitigated Negative Declaration certified by Planning Commission;
4 Apr 95	Planning Commission Meeting: Tentative Subdivision Map approved, TM 7948 for 278 lots in Resolution No. 95-12. Many requirements (99 general conditions) attached to the project by the Planning Commission, typically representing the comments of service providers such as Public Works, the Fire Department, and the Police; but also included Planning Commission requirements for: sound walls, fences, traffic lights, and roll-up garage doors. The project is still subject to Design Review by the Planning Commission; Minimal findings noted--related to GP and zoning consistency;
19 Apr 95	Environmental filing fee paid: \$1275. Notice of Determination filed on Negative declaration with statement of over-riding considerations;
1 May 95	Tentative Map shows 107 units for Phase I; 110 units for Phase II; and 61 units for Phase III;
Aug 95	Initial Building Permit Application submitted for master plan check;
21 Sep 95	Bond request for improvements phase for \$3.1 million;
25 Sep 95	Bond for improvements phase approved by American Motorists Insurance Corporation;
24 Oct 95	City Council Meeting: Resolution No. 95-222 approving Final Map 7948 for 106 units of Phase I. Subdivision Improvement Agreement approved;
7 Nov 95	Bond approved by American Motorists Insurance Corporation for Phase I @ \$3 million;
27 Dec 95	Master Building Permits for Models granted for Phase I;
28 May 96	Bond approved by American Motorists Insurance Corp. for Phase II @ \$1.5 million;
9 July 96	City Council Meeting: approval of Final Map 7995 for Phase II in Resolution No. 96-109;
6 Feb 97	Land acquisition by developer of parcels 019-110-040 and 019-290-031;
30 May 97	Project questionnaire for TSM 7948A and Phase III: indicates 2 new house plans and new unit counts, also indicates decreased lot coverage to 15% max and 25% paving max for Phase III's larger lot subdivision at minimum lot size of 7000 sf;
4 June 97	Application for Amendment to Subdivision 7948 with fee of \$3885--amending lot count to 107 units for phase I; 110 units for phase II; and 77 units for phase III;
17 July 97	Application submitted and fee of \$4575 for Phase III @ 77 units: TSM 7948A and DR 95-5A;
5 Aug 97	Planning Commission Meeting to hear amendment to TM 7948 and Phase III changes, continued to next meeting;
12 Aug 97	Phase III lot count reduced to 75 to accommodate street alignments and new access points to subdivision;
19 Aug 97	Planning Commission Meeting: approved amendment to Resolution No. 95-12 allowing 75 lots in Phase III; requires \$600K - 800K road improvements by developer to be reimbursed later;
14 Oct 97	City Council Meeting: Approving Resolution 97-215 for reimbursements to the developer for costs associated with Master Plan roadway improvements, parks, trails, and a water main in 5 annual payments totaling \$1.143 million;
Aug 98	Project in construction.

Total Time for Approvals:

Planned Development Approval:	1 June 1994 - 15 Nov 1994 = 5.5 months
TM Approval for first 3 phases:	11 Jan 1995 - 4 Apr 1995 = 2.75 months

California Department Housing and Community Development

TM Amendment:	4 June 1997 - 19 Aug 1995 = 2.25 months
Building Permit Approvals:	Aug 1995 - 27 Dec 1995 = 5 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

No public participation or opposition by individuals or community groups was noted during the Phase I approval process. However, after residents moved into the Phase I houses, some opposition arose concerning the subsequent phasing and construction.

CITY of CARLSBAD:
Deaville Village: single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name</i>	Village of Deauville at Poinsettia Shores
<i>Project Location:</i>	in southwest Carlsbad between Highway I-5 and Carlsbad Blvd north of Batiquitos Lagoon -Planning Area A-1 of Poinsettia Shores Specific Plan
<i>Developer:</i>	Kaiza Poinsettia Corporation / Saiga California Inc. 7220 Avenida Encinitas Ste 200, Carlsbad California 92009 619 931 9100 Poinsettia Homebuilding Partnership 4141 Jutland Drive Ste. 200, San Diego California 92117
<i>Owner:</i>	Same
<i>Project Components:</i>	-36 units on 8.4 acres = 4.29 units per acre -min lot size = 5000 sf -2 open space lots and 1 private street lot -3 house plans; each with 3 elevations -plan 1 = 3 bdrm / 2.5 ba + loft @ 2282 sf -plan 2 = 4 bdrm / 3 ba @ 2549 sf -plan 3 = 4 bdrm / 3 ba @ 2760 sf -all @ 2 stories and with 3 car garages -max height = 27' -108 parking spaces + 55 visitor spaces = 163 total spaces
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APN: 219-140-32 PUD 94-03 / Carlsbad Tract 94-04 California Coastal Commission Application: 6-95-51
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: O'Day Consultants Architecture: Lorimer Case Architects Landscape Architecture: Teshima Design Group

Project Description:

The gated "Village of Deauville" is located north of Avenida Encinitas and the Batiquitos Lagoon; south of the Lakeshore Gardens Mobile Home Park; west of Interstate 5 and east of Carlsbad Boulevard in southwest Carlsbad on a bluff overlooking the lagoon and ocean. This gated community is part of the larger master planned Poinsettia Shores development that has 10 other development parcels. The tract is known as Planning Area A-1 in the far northeast corner of the development next to I-5 along Avenida Encinitas. The property is a triangular "pie-shaped" parcel with the pointed end towards the northwest. The site plan is composed of a triangular loop road with corner knuckles that provides access to virtually every lot, save for two central lots that are accessed by a short shared access driveway. The main entry gate is located directly off a street to the southwest of the site that encircles another development parcel. The emergency access road is located mid-site along Avenida Encinitas. No lots have been located along the northern boundary at the mobile home park. Instead, resolutions with the mobile home park Home Owners Association and the Planning Department resulted in a meandering private trail with extensive landscaping directly adjacent to the loop road, inside the existing sound wall from the mobile

California Department Housing and Community Development

homes. This trail encircles the larger Poinsettia Shores community and connects to other parcels in the development. A slump block sound wall surrounds the rest of Planning Area A-1. Open space has also been located south of the entry gate to the tract. Entry medians with a call box divide in and out aisles at the entry gate.

The 5000 sf (minimum) lots are covered predominantly by the houses. Backyards are minimal on most lots and are surrounded by 6' wood fencing. The houses are designed for an up-market buyer in a contemporary Tudor-look. The houses are finished with stucco plaster, flat concrete roof tiles, masonry veneers and faux half-timbering on the front facade, double hung and sliding vinyl windows and muntins, wood fascias, out lookers, window sills, headers and door trim, inoperable wood shutters, roll-up garage doors, and decorative attic vents. A few arched windows are located at the rear. Some of the units have insubstantial porches and decks at the rear. The units are dominated by garages on their front elevations and sliding glass doors on the rear. Although the front elevation receives most of the detailing, some of the side elevations are exposed on corner lots; thus, some window trims and veneers wrap around the sides of the units.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project required Master Plan approval that included all zoning designations for the various development parcels. The tract was initially submitted simultaneously with an application for Planning Area A-2 in the same planned community directly to the south of this case study. However, the developer requested that the Master Plan be approved prior to the two tracts, and thus postponed approval of the tracts which extended the approval time considerably.

The project required a California Coastal Commission Development Permit that extended the approval process a few weeks.

The project required substantial grading to create adequate building pads for the houses, including: 13,900 cy of cut; 20,600 cy of fill; and 6700 cy of imported soils. Extensive drainage improvements were required by the Engineering Department, in addition to payment of Local Drainage fees.

Key Project Adjustments:

In the course of the approvals process, a few changes were made to the project through agency comments. The Engineering Department required additional emergency access to the site from Avenida Encinitas and a project identification sign at the main entrance; the Carlsbad Municipal Water District required both potable and reclaimed water systems for irrigation purposes; and the North County Transit District required pedestrian pathways to increase access through the project. An archaeologist was also required on site throughout grading to observe and monitor for cultural resources that were suspected on site. Also the project could not be started until the construction of Avenida Encinitas was completed.

The developer paid various fees and assessments, including: Local Drainage Area fees, Public Facilities fees, Local Facilities Management Fees (Carlsbad Zone 4), and Carlsbad Unified School District fees.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

5 May 93	Previous application submitted by Kaiza Poinsettia Corp. for Carlsbad Tract 93-06, Condo Permit 93-03, PUD 93-05, Hillside Development Permit 93-06, EIA, Notice Deposit and Public Facilities Fee—together @ \$31,967—all applications subsequently withdrawn but the fee left on deposit with city;
Nov 93	Engineer's drawings dated;

California Department Housing and Community Development

17 Jan 94	Applications submitted by Kaiza Poinsettia Corp. for Carlsbad Tract 94-01 for full planned community, Hillside Development Permit 94-03, EIA, Notice Deposit, Public Facilities Fee—fee of \$4570 deducted from previous credit;
Jan 94	Approval of Poinsettia Shores Master Plan MP-175D, Carlsbad Tract 94-01 and review of EIR 84-03 for full community; review of EIR produces new mitigations for proposal;
29 Apr 94	Application submitted with fee of \$102,193 for Tentative Tract Map and PUD for full community in Planning Area D; and specific fee of \$10,670 for Planning Area A-1;
29 Apr 94	Disclosure Statement submitted;
10 May 94	City Engineer's check list for application completion;
24 May 94	City Engineer's comments—application incomplete—many issues need clarification;
27 May 94	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: notice of incomplete application; agency comments included;
14 June 94	Noise Analysis by Mestre Greve Association, Report No. 94-95;
Aug 94	Project site graded;
Sept 94	General Plan EIR certified with various statements of over-riding consideration;
25 Oct 94	Applicant letter to Planning Department – re: request for city's approval of Planning Area D, prior to any subdivision application review;
4 Nov 94	Full submittal of exhibits by Engineer;
4 Nov 94	Architectural drawings dated;
4 Nov 94	Architectural guideline compliance summary;
4 Nov 94	EIA form submitted by Engineer: few significant impacts noted;
7 Dec 94	City Engineer's comments—application complete with a few minor comments;
12 Dec 94	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of complete application for PUD;
16 Dec 94	Routing to projects by Planning Department for further comment—comments due back 4 Jan 95;
19 Dec 94	Police Department / Crime Prevention comments—standard;
20 Dec 94	Community Services Department comments—minor;
20 Dec 94	Architectural guideline compliance summary revised;
23 Dec 94	Carlsbad Municipal Water District comments—requirement for both potable and reclaimed water systems;
23 Dec 94	Building and Safety comments—none;
28 Dec 94	Fire Department comments—standard with 13 conditions listed;
4 Jan 95	North County Transit District comments—request for pedestrian pathways to increase access through project to transit and for bicyclists;
17 Jan 95	Meeting of the Lakeshore Garden Mobile Home Park Home Owners Association with the developer to review the landscape plans with respect to the boundary between the developments for buffering purposes;
23 Jan 95	Land Use Engineer's comments—problems with grading and house pad elevations;
24 Jan 95	City Engineer letter to Applicant – re: sound walls required around project at various points;
25 Jan 95	Initial Study for Planning Area A-1 by Planning Department: more significant impacts noted than on Engineer's submittal; recommends Mitigated Negative Declaration as per earlier proposal;
26 Jan 95	Applicant transmittal to Planning Department – re: sound wall clarifications with support from Noise Analysis Report;
30 Jan 95	Applicant letter to Lakeshore Garden Mobile Home Park Home Owners Association – re: fulfillment of city's requirement to meet with them;
30 Jan 95	Notice of Public Hearing and Notice of Prior Environmental Compliance for both planning areas A-1 and A-2;
30 Jan 95	Notice of application completion for Planning Area A-1 tract;
31 Jan 95	California Department of Fish and Game: De Minimus Impact Finding and Certificate of Fee Exemption;
31 Jan 95	Revised Tentative Tract Map submitted by Engineer;
undated	Meeting between the Applicant and members of the Rosalena Home Owners Association;
1 Feb 95	Land Use Engineer's comments—problems with slope in drainage area;
8 Feb 95	Engineer's drawings revised;

California Department Housing and Community Development

8 Feb 95	City Engineer's Report and Conditions of Approval submitted to Planning Department—Engineering Department recommends approval of project with standard comments and a few site specific comments, including a mandate for emergency egress only at Street I from Avenida Encinitas;
23 Feb 95	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: Staff Report available for review;
1 Mar 95	Mailing labels submitted by Engineer;
3 Mar 95	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 15 Mar 95;
13 Mar 95	City Engineer's Report—modifications to conditions to include mandate for payment of Planned Local Drainage Area Fee, and requirement for undergrounding of all utilities;
15 Mar 95	Planning Department memo to Planning Commission – re: corrections and modifications to project exhibits;
15 Mar 95	Planning Department Staff Report – recommended approval of project; affordable housing requirements satisfied by provision of other tract within Planning Area D;
15 Mar 95	Planning Commission meeting: project approved by two Resolutions; Resolution. No. 3751 passes unanimously approving tract with Conditions of Approval, which are listed by agency and category of condition, including: extensive maintenance and landscaping conditions for the CC&Rs, housing agreement for affordable housing site and development to be signed by Applicant and city prior to recordation of the final map; extensive findings noted, which are listed by category (General, Tentative Map, Growth Management, Landscaping, Coastal Zone, or Environmental); Planning Commission objected to excessive chimneys on the houses and moved to limit the houses to only 2 chimneys each, which was approved; developer objected to Drainage Fees—suggesting that the project took care of on-site drainage through improvements—PC rejected this notion; Resolution. No. 3752 also passes unanimously for PUD with extensive findings detailing site specific consistency with General Plan, Master Plan, and adjacent land uses and the environment. If no appeal of the PC decision is made within 10 days no City Council action will be required and the project is approved;
20 Mar 95	California Coastal Commission application filed;
22 Mar 95	Notice of Determination filed with notice of Mitigated Negative Declaration;
25 Mar 95	Effective Date of Planning Commission Project Approval: no appeal made within 10 day period—project approved;
3 Apr 95	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of Planning Commission approval;
12 Apr 95	California Coastal Commission Staff Report;
9-12 May 95	California Coastal Commission Hearing and project approval;
14 Aug 97	Building Permit application date; for models at 7340 and 7344 Binnacle Drive; houses sizes and designs adjusted marginally from initial application;
Aug 98	Project in construction, continuing

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	29 Apr 1994 - 15 Mar 1995 = 10.5 months
Project Approval by California Coastal Commission:	29 Mar 1995 - 12 May 1995 = 1.5 months
Master Building Permit Approval:	14 Aug 1997 - 15 Oct 1997 = 2 months
Building Construction period:	15 Oct 1997 - Aug 1998 = 9.5 months, continuing

Public Participation / Opposition:

There was some public opposition from community groups to the project. The Lakeshore Gardens Mobile Home Park Home Owners Association had various concerns with respect to fencing and buffering of the project with landscaping. The Rosalena Home Owners Association also had various concerns about the project. The Planning Department required the developer to meet with these groups and settle differences prior to approval of the project.

CITY of CHINO HILLS:
Champion III: single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name:</i>	Champion Collection II
<i>Project Location:</i>	North of Chino Hills Parkway West of Carbon Canyon Rd (Highway 142) in central Chino Hills
<i>Developer:</i>	Van Daele Development Corporation 2900 Adams Street Ste. C-25, Riverside California 92504 909 354 2121
<i>Owner:</i>	James and Bernice Dupree 2930 Carbon Canyon Road, Chino Hills California 91710
<i>Project Components:</i>	-55 residential units on 20.31 acres = 2.71 units per acre -lot sizes range from 6000 sf to 16,874 sf. -4 lettered lots for landscaping, sloped areas, & electricity easement -1 remainder lot with an existing single family residence -three house plans each with three elevation options -plan A: 4 bdrm, 2.5 ba, 2 story @ 1916 sf ea -plan B: 4 bdrm +, 3 ba, 2 story @ 2268 sf ea -plan C: 4 bdrm +, 3 ba, 2 story @ 2302 sf ea -all with 2 car garages, driveways, front- and -backyards; -streetside parking throughout the development -no community amenities or recreation centers on site -large 210' partially landscaped electric tower easement through center of subdivision
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APNs: 1032-151-01, -03, -04 Tentative Tract Map 15723 Planning Department Reference No. 95 TM 19
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Thielmann Engineers Architecture: William Hezmallach Architects, Inc.

Project Description:

This housing subdivision is located on Chino Hills Parkway, the major freeway off-ramp and road cutting through central Chino Hills. The project site is a triangular parcel bordered on two sides by streets. To the south of the project site is vacant land reserved as recreational open space across Chino Hills Parkway; to the north and west of the project are other single family residential tracts; to the east are Little Chino Creek and single family residences in the Champions Collection I series by the same developer, across Rustic Drive. The site is divided in two by a 210' wide Southern California Edison easement for high voltage electrical power lines and towers. This area was required by the city to be landscaped by the developer. A San Bernardino County Flood Control District easement and access road is located adjacent to the property at its most southerly part to access Little Chino Creek.

The site is composed of a single staggered road through the project with many internal cul-de-sacs. This staggered through road joins the two portions of the development (to the southeast and northwest) that are located at either side of the high voltage easement. Vehicular access points are located at Chino Hills Parkway to the

California Department Housing and Community Development

northwest portion; and at Rustic Drive for the southeast portion. All other residential streets in the subdivision are cul-de-sacs that branch off this through road. Along Chino Hills Parkway the developer was required to continue the horse, bicycle and pedestrian trail fronting adjacent properties. This trail also meanders through the high voltage easement as an access road for Southern California Edison at the north edge of the right-of-way. There is full curbside parking throughout the development. The lots at cul-de-sac ends and at the perimeter of the tract are much larger than the interior lots and have substantial backyards. The interior lots have considerably smaller backyards. The project has been fenced with wood at the perimeter, along the easement, and between the lots; a CMU sound wall along Chino Hills Parkway was required by the city.

The buildings are designed in a contemporary suburban style. Each of the three models has 3 elevation options for the buyer. The front elevations are dominated by garages on all of the options. The front facades are lightly detailed, and the other 3 sides of each unit are relatively unadorned. The front elevations are finished with stucco plaster on the walls, flat concrete tiles for the roof, minimal door and window trim, vinyl windows, inoperable shutters, and painted wood fascias. The hip and gable roofed buildings have few pop out elements on the front elevations to create visual interest and curb appeal. The models are very typical of Southern California suburban subdivisions.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project site originally fell under the jurisdiction of the Gordon Ranch PUD when it was zoned. No zone change however was required for the project site.

The developers took advantage of a voluntary pre-application review (with fee) offered by the Community Development Department. This enabled the developers to receive comments from relevant agencies and service providers to assess the costs, scheduling, and design of the project. The Development Review Committee completed this preliminary review and outlined to the developer the approvals process for the project.

The site is hilly and was originally covered with grasses and trees and a few out-buildings. The project site is located on the downward slopes of two hills that meet in a shallow valley where the electrical easement is positioned at the center of the tract. Substantial grading was required to prepare the site for construction. Drainage slopes and building pads had to be created for house construction; street and cul-de-sac elevations required extensive earth moving.

Demolitions were required for two barns and horse corrals that were located on the site. The existing single family residence in the farthest northern corner of the site was maintained. A substantially larger remainder lot was created around this existing house at the end of a new cul-de-sac to bring the house into the fabric of the rest of the tract.

The high voltage towers that crossed the site remained intact through the project, although location of the easement beneath them was adjusted to align more centrally with the power lines.

The Environmental Assessment for the project was tiered off the General Plan EIR that had recently been certified during the previous year on 13 Sept 1994. Many environmental issues were raised in the Initial Study, most notably, the presence of paleontological resources throughout the Chino Hills area and possibly at the project site. This required the on-site presence of an expert to monitor grading.

Since the house designs offered under this project were identical to those on the adjacent Champion Collection I tract by the same developer, the same set of model homes was used for both projects. Thus the building permits for the models were issued prior to the approval of the Champion Collection II series within this case study.

California Department Housing and Community Development

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers and agencies were generally of a standard nature, but very extensive. The conditions of approval for this project are extremely extensive and detailed. Additional project site reporting was mandated on a variety of environmental topics. Various impact and assessment district fees were required by a variety of agencies. A few physical additions were made to the project through agency comment. All of these were addressed at the Planning Commission meeting held 2/20/96, as noted below.

No change in the unit count was noted in the project file through the course of the approvals process.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

8 May 78	Land acquired by owners;
15 Feb 95	Building Permit application submitted for models @ 3139 Champion Street within Champion Collection I tract, adjacent to case study project site;
Sept 95	Pre-application review process begins for project;
7 Sept 95	CC&Rs submitted for review and approved by Planning Department;
25 Sept 95	Development Review Committee meeting with relevant agencies and the Applicants to complete voluntary pre-application review on the project; no loss of lots or units; required off-site sidewalk and equestrian trail improvements; required landscaping and relocation of high voltage easement; minimal changes to project; positive review and green-light given to project;
25 Sept 95	Chino Valley Unified School District letter; significant impacts noted due to overcrowding; requirement for 3 bus loading zones with bus stops;
26 Sept 95	Chino Valley Independent Fire District comments – standard code comments;
27 Oct 95	Tentative Tract Map Application submitted;
1 Nov 95	Project routed to agencies for comments;
1 Nov 95	Land Use Application Questionnaire;
21 Nov 95	Building Permits for models issued for adjacent project using the same models;
30 Nov 95	Public Works comments – conditions revised;
early Dec 95	Notice of Public Availability of Environmental Assessment and Initial Study;
15 Dec 95	Public Review Period for environmental documents begins;
15 Jan 96	Public Review Period for environmental documents ends;
18 Jan 96	Notice of Public Availability of Mitigated Negative declaration and Initial Study for review;
18 Jan 96	Notice of Public Hearing & Affidavit of Mailing for Planning Commission meeting of 20 Feb 96;
25 Jan 96	Second Public Review Period for environmental documents begins;
13 Feb 96	Chino Valley Independent Fire District comments – hydrant pressure on hills is an issue;
14 Feb 96	Second Public Review Period for environmental documents ends;
20 Feb 96	Staff Report with 11 findings noted;
20 Feb 96	Planning Commission meeting; approved project and tentative tract map and certified Mitigated Negative declaration; 100 <u>extensive</u> conditions of approval on 17 pages included with the project approval; conditions are listed by the agency requiring the conditions and by the deadline within the approval process; the conditions include the following requirements: plague control measures within the Chino Hills area, a 3' x 7' concrete slab at each unit for solid waste separation, paleontological monitoring during grading, an acoustical study, annexation to the Community Facilities District, Facility Development Fees, participation in Ord. No. 65 Facilities Benefit District, Soils and Geological Reports, a grading performance bond, an Encroachment Permit from Public Works, a Water Master Plan Report, a Landscape Master Plan for the SoCal Edison property and the equestrian trail, 20' dedication of the equestrian trail along Chino Hills Parkway to the city, participation in Chino Hills Landscape, Lighting and Maintenance District No. 1, dedication of all open space areas to the city, a performance bond for restoration of all open space areas @ \$1000 per acre, a maintenance bond of 25% of the open space performance bond to maintain these areas, in-lieu park facility

California Department Housing and Community Development

	fees, a reimbursement agreement for 25% of the total cost for landscaping and irrigation along Chino Hills Parkway, fire sprinklers in all the units, and a fuel modification program at the project perimeter to deter possible grass fire escalation; No Home Owners Association was included in the project—as the market indicates this was not a selling point at the time of the project; unanimous approvals were granted by the Planning Commission; Opposition from just a couple of residents in the area was voiced;
26 Feb 96	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of Planning Commission decision;
27 Feb 96	City Council meeting: no action taken to change Planning Commission decision; project effective;
29 Feb 96	Notice of Determination sent to County Clerk of San Bernardino County;
22 Apr 96	Public Health comments – required sound wall at Chino Hills Parkway and mechanical ventilation to accommodate closed windows for sound suppression;
30 Apr 96	Revised Acoustical Analysis completed;
15 May 96	Building Permits finalized and Certificates of Occupancy issued for models;
2 July 96	Title Report with agreement for restriction on location of the equestrian trail;
12 Aug 96	Vector Ecologist Report – re: ecto-parasite and vector control for possible plague in area--negated; condition sign-off;
30 Sept 96	Applicant letter to Planning Department – re: final map recording;
5 Nov 96	Chino Valley Independent Fire District letter to Planning Department – re: clarification of condition with regard to fuel modification requirements for project perimeter;
Aug 98	Construction continues on the units.

Total Time for Approvals:

Building Permit Approval for models:	15 Feb 1995 - 21 Nov 1995 = 9.25 months (adjacent project)
Project Approval by City:	27 Oct 1995 - 27 Feb 1996 = 4 months
Building Construction Period for models:	21 Nov 1995 - 15 May 1996 = 5.75 months (adjacent project)
Building Construction Period for lots:	15 May 1996 - Aug 1998 = 27.5 months, continuing

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received little opposition from neighbors and other groups. Just a couple of neighbors voiced concern over the project at the Planning Commission meeting where the project was approved. The project file did not indicate what concerns these residents had with the project.

CITY of CORONA:
West Venture: single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name:</i>	West Venture at Corona Ranch
<i>Project Location:</i>	southeast corner of Yuma Drive and Parkridge Avenue in Corona Ranch area models at 1402, 1412, and 1422 Goldeneagle Drive
<i>Developer:</i>	West Venture Homes 300 E. Magnolia Boulevard Ste. 400, Burbank California 91502 818 567 3100 William Lyon Homes, Inc. 4490 Von Karman, Newport Beach California 92658-7520 714 833 3600
<i>Owner:</i>	Rivendell Land Co. 22892 Mill Creek Drive Ste. B, Laguna Hills California 92653 714 581 4994 Bank of America Properties 333 S. Beaudry Ave, Second Floor, Los Angeles California 90017 213 345 4911
<i>Project Components:</i>	-162 total units on 20.8 acres = 7.79 units per acre -property subdivided into 30 lots with multiple units per lot -lot sizes range from 3150 sf to 10117 sf -avg. lot size = 3785 sf -four house plans each with three elevation options -plan A: 3 bdrm, 2.5 ba, 1 story = 25 units @ 1380 sf ea -plan B: 3 bdrm, 2.5 ba, 2 story = 36 units @ 1544 sf ea -plan C: 4 bdrm, 2.5 ba, 2 story = 44 units @ 1660 sf ea -plan D: 4 bdrm + loft, 2.5 ba, 2 story = 57 units @ 1754 sf ea -all with 2 car garages, driveways, front- and -backyards; -streetside parking throughout the development -playfield, swimming pool, spa, cabana, restrooms, picnic and BBQ areas
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APNs: 122-220-025 Tentative Tract Map 28362 General Plan Amendment 96-04 Development Plan Review 96-01 Precise Plan 96-04 Special Plan Amendment 96-06
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Hunsaker Associates Irvine, Inc. Architecture: William Hezmallach Architects, Inc.

Project Description:

This housing subdivision is located in the Corona Ranch area of northern Corona. To the north of the project site is vacant land in the city of Norco across Yuma Drive; to the south are a park and vacant land planned for medium density residential uses; to the east are single family residences across Village Loop Drive; to the west are single family residences across Parkridge Avenue. Vehicular access to the site is from Yuma Drive and Parkridge Avenue. A recreation area, with a swimming pool, spa, cabanas, restrooms, playing field, and a picnic area are located near the center of the project, just opposite the vehicular entrance at Yuma Drive. A sound wall surrounds the project to the north, east and west. Backyards are divided by wood fencing.

The site plan is composed of a series of loop roads. There are no cul-de-sacs in the development. Adjacent parkland to the southeast is fully accessible to the project with several hundred feet of street frontage to this subdivision, as only one lot has been positioned adjacent to the park. A stub street has been located just west of the park to a planned subdivision to the southwest. There is full curbside parking throughout the development. The lots at interior corners and those to the east are very large, with substantial backyards. The rest of the lots have considerably smaller backyards.

The buildings are designed in various Mediterranean, suburban, and Mission styles, depending on the elevation option the buyer chooses. The front elevations are dominated by garages on all of the options. The front facades are heavily detailed, while the other 3 elevations are relatively unadorned. The front elevations are finished with stucco plaster finish on the walls, barrel or flat concrete tiles for the roof, extensive door and window trim, single hung and sliding windows with muntins, inoperable shutters, wood outlookers and knee braces, stained or painted wood fascias, and decorative attic vents. The hip and gable roofed buildings have many pop out elements to create visual interest and curb appeal.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project is within the Corona Ranch Special Planning Area. This special plan was adopted on 20 Nov 1985 for a maximum of 3388 dwelling units, along with 12 acres of commercial use, 3 neighborhood parks, 2 elementary schools, and a fire station. This subdivision is one of the last projects in Corona Ranch. No rezone was required for the project, however General Plan and Special Planning Area amendments were both required with respect to physical development standards requested under the project. Environmental Assessment for the project is tiered off of the previous EIR for Corona Ranch that was also completed in 1985. Few major environmental assessments are noted, save for the potential loss of habitat for Stephen's kangaroo rat, which has been found on adjacent properties to the west of Corona Ranch. The site was vacant and relatively flat prior to construction. Little grading was required to prepare the site for construction.

Through examination of the project chronology it appears that the Tentative Tract Map and Development Plan approvals were required prior to the amendments to the General Plan or Specific Plan Amendment. This linear approval process seems to have added substantial time to project preparation.

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers were generally of a standard nature and very minimal. Various impact and assessment district fees were paid, including: landscape maintenance district, parks, schools, community facilities district, development impact, permit, planning, building and other approvals fees. Only a few physical additions were made to the project through agency comment, including: a sound wall around the development, roll-up garage doors, landscaping and fencing materials specifications.

No change in the unit count was noted in the project file through the course of the approvals process.

California Department Housing and Community Development

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

2 Aug 85	City Council certifies Corona Ranch EIR;
20 June 95	Title Report from First American Title Insurance Co;
29 Jan 96	Staff have received many phone calls from concerned residents unaware of the current high density residential zoning designation; many are concerned with the lack of schools in the Corona Ranch area;
19 Feb 96	Engineer's drawings dated;
26 Mar 96	Noise Study recommends sound wall around project;
2 Apr 96	Environmental Information form filled out by Applicant;
8 Apr 96	Application submitted for Tentative Tract Map and Development Plan Review with fees of \$3305;
10 Apr 96	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: scheduled meeting with PERC for 18 Apr 96;
11 Apr 96	Project routed to agencies for comment;
16 Apr 96	Riverside Transit Agency comments—none;
18 Apr 96	Project and Environmental Review Committee meeting – continued to next meeting;
23 July 96	Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District comments – standard;
23 July 96	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of PERC meeting continuance;
17 Oct 96	Tax consultant letter to Pulte Homes – re: community facilities district fees of \$1403 per lot;
4 Nov 96	Project and Environmental Review Committee meeting – continued to next meeting;
13 Nov 96	Taxation Analysis completed; Community Facilities District fees of \$1350 per unit required;
14 Nov 96	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of PERC meeting continuance with notification of \$10,616 in fees for GP and SPA amendments;;
21 Nov 96	Corona - Norco Unified SD comments -- fees of \$1.84 per sf required;
4 Dec 96	Application submitted for Precise Plan and Specific Plan Amendment; Community Development Department receipt; \$4380 in fees paid;
4 Dec 96	Project routed to agencies for comment;
10 Dec 96	Pacific Telephone comments – none;
12 Dec 96	Project Review Committee meeting; internal staff meeting;
16 Dec 96	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: Project Review Committee meeting continued; revisions needed with respect to various agency comments;
31 Dec 96	Project and Environmental Review Committee routing to agencies for comment;
8 Jan 97	Project and Environmental Review Committee routing to agencies for comment;
8 Jan 97	Project routed to agencies for comments – re: resubmittal of TTM with changes;
9 Jan 97	Project and Environmental Review Committee meeting; recommended Mitigated Negative Declaration after review of project and applicant submittals;
13 Jan 97	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: Planning Environmental Review Committee notification of approval; project scheduled for Planning Commission meeting of 10 Feb 97;
16 Jan 97	Initial Study for Environmental Assessment completed; no significant impacts noted; Mitigated Negative Declaration recommended;
21 Jan 97	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 10 Feb 97;
27 Jan 97	Notice of Preparation of Draft conditions of approval – public comment period opens for Planning Commission meeting;
10 Feb 97	Staff Report for Planning Commission; recommendation for approval of all permits and adoption of Mitigated Negative Declaration;
10 Feb 97	Planning Department letter to Planning Commission – re: request for continuance by staff for unspecified reasons;
10 Feb 97	Planning Commission meeting: project continued to next meeting;
12 Feb 97	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of Planning Commission continuance;
12 Feb 97	Meeting between Planning Department and Applicant – re: discussion of incomplete application issues;
20 Mar 97	Staff Report mailed to applicant;
24 Mar 97	Applicant letter to Planning Department – re: request for changes to conditions of approval;

California Department Housing and Community Development

24 Mar 97 **Planning Commission meeting: approved project and conditions of approval by unanimous approval;** Resolution. No. 1777; conditions pertain to the following issues – materials for fencing and landscaping, roll-up garage doors, continued right of the Planning Department to review and approve design and submittals, and other standard conditions; no public opposition presented;

25 Mar 97 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of Planning Commission decisions and scheduled City Council meeting of 2 Apr 97;

31 Mar 97 Full conditions of approval revised; 7 pages with 72 standard and specific conditions – listed by department submitting the condition and whether standard or specific;

2 Apr 97 **City Council meeting – Council requested to review Planning Commission decisions; Council took no action; project effective;**

3 Apr 97 Notice of Determination transmitted to County Clerk;

3 Apr 97 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of City Council non-action and project approval;

3 Apr 97 Conditions of Approval amended – minor changes;

16 Apr 97 Final Conditions of Approval prepared for tentative tract map;

4 Feb 98 William Lyon Homes Inc letter to Planning Department – re: request for approval of floor plan and elevation changes;

20 Feb 98 Planning Department approves floor plan and elevation changes;

20 Feb 98 **Building Permit application submitted for models;**

18 Mar 98 City Council meeting: approval of final tract map;

9 Apr 98 **Building Permits issued; project begins construction.**

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	8 Apr 1996 - 2 Apr 1997 = 11.75 months
Building Permit Approval:	20 Feb 1998 - 9 Apr 1998 = 1.5 months
Building Construction Period:	9 April 1998 - Aug 98, continuing

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received little opposition from neighbors and other groups. A few phone calls were received by the Planning Department due to concern over school impacts and high density residential development in the Corona Ranch area. Residents seemed unaware of existing zoning designations of certain parcels in their community.

EL DORADO COUNTY:
Colony: single-family subdivision

Project Name: The Colony at El Dorado Hills
(Creekside Greens previous name)

Project Location: South side of White Rock Road
.3 miles from Latrobe Road and
north of Golden Foothill Parkway

Developer: Jack Rice
7352 Lakeshore Drive, Roseville California 95661
916 726 7258

Placer Development Corporation
7525 Auburn Boulevard, Ste. 8, Citrus Heights California 95610

Creekside Colony Limited Partners,
Pacific Valley Housing Corporation,

Coldwell Banker / Del Nichols
530 621 3300

Owner: Jack Rice

Charlie Oewel / Bob Kagan
415 446 1800

Project Components: -201 residential lots on 56.23 acres = 3.56 units per acre
-8 lettered landscaped lots at the entrance, a creek bisecting the
property, a lake, an open space lot and at the perimeter
-lot sizes range from 6386 sf to 10,080 sf.
-four floor plans:
-plan 1: 4 bdrm + den / 2.5 ba, 3 car garage @ 2300 sf
-plan 2: 5 bdrm / 3 ba, 2 car garage @ 2600 sf
-plan 3: 5 bdrm + den / 3 ba, 2 car garage @ 2600 sf +
-plan 4: 6 bdrm / 3 ba, 2 car garage @ 2400 sf
-prices range from \$199,900 to \$244,500
-no community amenities or recreation centers on site
-project in four phases

Project Numbers: APN: 107-010-24
Tentative Tract Map: TM 90-1217
Rezone: Z 94-24
Parcel Map: P 89-08
Planned Development Permit: PD 94-11

Project Consultants: Civil Engineering: Gene E. Thorne and Associates, Inc.

Project Description:

This housing subdivision is located on White Rock Road in the El Dorado Hills / Salmon Falls area of El Dorado County. The project site is an “L” shaped parcel with a narrower 660 foot wide piece connecting to White Rock Road at the north. The parcel widens into a larger square shaped parcel towards the south, which is approximately 1350’ square. The parcel is located in an area of rolling grass lands periodically interrupted by creeks coming down from the hills to the north. A creek bisects this site along its north-south axis, entering the site through a culvert at the center of the northern boundary across White Rock Road, bending to the east, before exiting at the southeast corner. An emergency retention basin has also been created at the center of the largest landscape lot at the far north edge of the property. The property is located in an rather undeveloped area.

There are two access points to the parcel. The primary vehicular access point is located at the northwest corner at White Rock Road. The secondary access point is located in the southwest corner, leading to Golden Foothill Parkway and Latrobe Road. The site is primarily composed of a large loop road running parallel to the creek at its center across the project site. The primary entrance road forks 200’ into the property. One fork heads east, crossing the creek and heading south (Concordia Drive). The other fork (Monte Verde Drive) heads due south where it exits the property at the secondary access point. A third road crosses the creek near the southern edge of the parcel, connecting these two roads to create the large loop between them. Other loop roads and a single cul-de-sac are located to the east of this primary loop road.

In addition to the large landscaped lot at the entrance on White Rock Road, the riparian area along the creek has been designated as three of the landscaped lots (per various construction phases). Other landscaped lots are located along the eastern border, and in a park area centered east of the creek at the northeast corner of the property.

The parcel is subdivided into narrow, deep lots with a minimum of street frontage. The project site has been divided into four construction phases. Phase II in the southwest corner of the site has considerably larger lots, which are more irregularly shaped, in contrast to the small rectangular lots of the other three phases.

There was no information on the house plans or house construction in the County’s project files. In contrast to assertions that smaller, moderate income housing would be built—the series of houses offered for sale are large and relatively expensive for the area. The houses are designed in a standard contemporary suburban style. They are finished with stucco and wood siding, concrete tile roofs, and aluminum windows. As of September 1998, the project has been in bankruptcy proceedings. The four models have been constructed, and only 6 houses have been built. None have been sold thus far. The models are only open on the weekends. Marketing and sales are being handled by Coldwell Banker.

Planning and Development Issues:

The developer had an extremely difficult time getting the entitlements for this project. The original application for the project was submitted in 1989, and after two building moratoria, was finally approved in 1996. Lack of water resources caused the county to place a moratorium on all new entitlements and projects twice during the early 1990s.

In addition to the water moratoria, the project was also delayed because the county was updating its General Plan. The Area Plans were determined to be internally inconsistent and the county was facing the threat of litigation on any substantial development project. The project site initially fell under the jurisdiction of the El Dorado Hills / Salmon Falls Area Plan, which was developed in the early 1980s. Via a time extension granted by the state for the county to adopt the new General Plan, the county was unable to approve any project over a certain size that required a rezone, among other restrictions. Additionally, the changing policies of the new plan, adopted in January 1996, required that the project be developed at a minimum density, necessitating one of the changes made to the project. Typically, all project permits are processed concurrently, rather than linearly, as happened with this project.

California Department Housing and Community Development

Later confusion over the permits required for this project also caused some delay. The developer initially submitted all permit applications concurrently, but the Planning Department mandated that the property be rezoned prior to granting a Planned Development Permit or approving the tentative map. This linear process added significant time to the approvals process.

Planning Department staff preferred that the applicant develop a mixed use residential townhouse scheme on the site. The developer proposed a low-end single family project that was pushed up-scale as the project proceeded. To maximize the buildable flat areas of the parcel, and to accommodate lots that were smaller than the minimum lot size allowed in the existing zone designation, the developer was forced to request a zone change for the property. The site was originally zoned for multi-family residential uses (RM). The Planning Department midway through the entitlements process suggested that the project site be designated as a planned development overlay district for limited multi-family residential (R2-PD), in accord with the densities preferred by the applicant.

The project underwent moderate environmental analysis. The developer was asked to produce many reports and studies for the project site, including: a wetlands delineation report, various botanical studies, an acoustical study along White Rock Road, a wetlands mitigation and monitoring program, a traffic impact study and an archaeological resources report. The project received a Mitigated Negative Declaration from the Planning Department. Since the US Army Corps of Engineers delineated 3.21 acres of wetlands on the property, a mitigation and monitoring program was created for the remaining wetlands on the site. The developer acquired a USACE permit to fill 1 acre of the wetlands on the site. Although the project site is within the historical 100 year flood zone, only minimal flooding has been recorded at the site.

The site was originally covered by 80% native grasses, 10% brush and 10% trees—primarily in the riparian corridor alongside the creek down the center of the property. The county required tree preservation measures for the oaks, cottonwoods, and willows in this riparian zone. The slightly sloping topography down to the creek required significant grading to create construction pads for the houses. The Planning Department required significant setbacks from the center line of the creek to protect the riparian zone from grading and development impacts.

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers and agencies were extensive and wide-ranging. The project was routed to many agencies for comment several times, due to the prolonged entitlements process. Although many agencies were approached for comment, few physical changes were made to the project. The key change to the site plan was the addition of a second vehicular access point at the south end of the property for emergency service purposes. This second means of access caused a decrease of one lot from the 201 that were originally proposed.

The project was charged various assessment district and impact fees at the time of building permit issuance, including: Highway / Arterial fees at \$1000 / unit, school impact fees at \$7198 / unit; El Dorado / Salmon Falls road fees at \$1785 / unit; landscape and lighting assessment district fees, El Dorado Community Service District fees, and drainage benefit district fees, among others. Road dedications were rejected by the county, but several of the landscaped lots and park lands were dedicated to the El Dorado Hills Community Services District. Other open space parcels were to be owned and maintained by a Home Owners Association unless the Community Services District is willing to take them in the future. Physical changes to the project were minor, but included the addition of a bike, equestrian and hiking trail through the site at White Rock Road, construction of a wetlands retention basin at the north end of the property, and special slope planting to inhibit erosion. The developer was also required to form a Home Owners Association for upkeep of the roads and landscaping within the project area.

Midway through the entitlements process, the applicant requested a change in the phasing of the project; requesting four phases instead of three. This request was granted. More recently, the developer reduced the lot count even further with site plan revisions to accommodate larger house plans.

California Department Housing and Community Development

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

24 May 83	Land acquired by current owner / developer; Title recorded;
17 Jan 89	Tentative Parcel Map application submitted with fee of \$420;
18 Jan 89	Original application for project submitted;
27 Mar 89	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: circulation problems with site plan;
15 June 89	Planning Commission meeting: confusion with parcel map; application is withdrawn and resubmitted later;
1 Aug 89	Wetland Delineation Report by Huffman and Associates, Inc;
5 Oct 89	USACE wetlands delineation letter;
12 Mar 90	Building moratorium begins due to lack of water resources;
5 May 90	Engineer's drawings dated; lots surveyed;
15 May 90	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of building moratorium due to lack of water resources; application and file for project are to be considered incomplete; 22 projects in County are suspended;
23 May 90	Land Capability Report by Engineer;
30 May 90	Initial Study for Environmental Assessment completed by Planning Department: significant impacts noted to wetlands that are located at the project site; USACE approved wetland delineation map; Applicant indicates 1 acre of wetlands are to be filled in;
4 June 90	Application resubmitted;
6 June 90	Engineer submits new road layout and parcel map;
14 June 90	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: building moratorium notification;
27 June 90	Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: request to process application during the moratorium;
3 July 90	Planning Department letter to Applicant: project application deemed incomplete;
Jan 91	Project Planner reassigned within Planning Department: project gets new planner;
1 Oct 91	Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: circulation issues and project approval scheduling;
14 Jan 92	Planning Department letter to Engineer – re: circulation problems with site plan and road layout;
8 June 92	Applicant letter to El Dorado County Irrigation District – re: request for water and sewer requirements;
12 June 92	Building moratorium is lifted due to adequate water resources;
16 June 92	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: building moratorium lifted; a will serve letter for water meters required from El Dorado County Irrigation District;
20 July 92	El Dorado County Irrigation District letter to Applicant – re: requirements for irrigation and water system forwarded; project at 192 lots;
21 Aug 92	Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: reactivation of project file; request to change to process all applications together;
22 Sept 92	Archeological Report: no significant impacts from project;
6 Oct 92	Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: wetlands and botanical studies have been shifted to spring to account for vernal pools;
26 Oct 92	Planning Department letter to Engineer – re: update letter with current comments;
9 Nov 92	Building moratorium begins due to lack of water resources;
11 Dec 92	Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: Engineer questions whether a new wetlands delineation is necessary; wetlands and botanical study issues discussed;
11 Jan 93	California Department of Fish and Game comments: Wetlands Mitigation and Monitoring Program required;
30 Mar 93	USACE letter to Engineer – re: Nationwide Permit No. 26 will be approved when a State Water Quality Certificate is received;

California Department Housing and Community Development

29 Apr 93	Planning Department letter to Engineer – re: notification of incomplete application with regard to environmental requirements;
3 May 93	Engineer resubmits tentative map with revisions;
10 June 93	El Dorado Hills Community Services District comments: park land dedication issues; landscape buffers required; bike and pedestrian lanes required;
6 July 93	Creekside Greens Traffic Impact Study by Fehr & Peers Associates, Inc;
16 July 93	Mitigation Plan for project created; species lists compiled for California Department of Fish and Game;
6 Aug 93	Site plan revisions made to Engineer's drawings;
9 Aug 93	Building moratorium is lifted due to adequate water resources;
21 Sept 93	Comment log started by Planning Department;
27 Dec 93	Site plan revisions made to Engineer's drawings;
3 Jan 94	Planning Department memo to file – re: submittal of revised site plan and project application expected;
7 Jan 94	Application for current project submitted with fee of \$6333;
7 Jan 94	Planning Department submittals: Traffic Study, Archaeological Resources Report, and Botanical Study for EIR;
7 Jan 94	Environmental Assessment Form completed by Applicant: same results and recommendation for Mitigated Negative Declaration as previous initial study for earlier 192 lot proposal;
14 Jan 94	El Dorado County Irrigation District letter to Applicant – re: requirements for irrigation and water system forwarded; project at 200 lots;
26 Jan 94	Project routed to agencies for comment; due back by 25 Feb 94;
31 Jan 94	El Dorado County Erosion Control comments: requirements and specifications forwarded;
31 Jan 94	El Dorado County Conservation District comments: conditions forwarded;
4 Feb 94	PG&E comments;
7 Feb 94	El Dorado County Environmental Management Department comments: letters of approval required from several state agencies; EIR recommended;
18 Feb 94	El Dorado County Sheriff's Department comments: mitigation fees of \$26,400 required;
23 Feb 94	El Dorado Hills Fire Department comments;
24 Feb 94	Department of Transportation comments: extensive comments provided; dedications required for Rights of Way along White Rock Road;
24 Feb 94	El Dorado Indian Council comments;
25 Feb 94	El Dorado Hills Community Service District comments: parkland must be dedicated to them; landscape buffering is required; participation in the local Lighting and Landscape Assessment District is mandated for maintenance purposes;
7 Mar 94	LAFCO comments;
8 Mar 94	El Dorado County Erosion Control comments: requirements and specifications forwarded for landscape planting and grading;
10 Mar 94	Initial Study for Environmental Assessment with Environmental Check List: potential impacts noted for: soils, population increases, air emissions, drainage, noise, light and glare, transportation increases, public service increases, obstructed views, and decreased recreational opportunities; findings of cumulative impact are made;
14 Mar 94	Technical Advisory Committee meeting: application deemed incomplete; tree protection issues; some lots don't meet grading standards; noise concerns for 2 lots from traffic on White Rock Road; drainage problems; wetlands delineation from USACE required; road impact fees required;
16 Mar 94	El Dorado Hills Community Service District comments: 3.3 acres of parkland improvements are required;
30 Mar 94	Planning Department memo to file – re: request to delay application processing so that design can be reconsidered; project officially on hold at Applicant's request;
7 Apr 94	California Regional Water Quality Control Board comments;
15 Apr 94	El Dorado Hills / Salmon Falls Area Plan Advisory Committee comments: conditional support granted dependent on CC&Rs;

California Department Housing and Community Development

3 May 94	Planning Department memo to file – re: current elevations are above base flood level;
15 July 94	Site plan revisions made to Engineer's drawings;
28 July 94	Grading, water and sewer submittals from Engineer;
1 Aug 94	Project routed to agencies for comment; due back by 30 Aug 94;
19 Aug 94	Department of Transportation comments: significant environmental impacts anticipated; dedications and fees required;
19 Aug 94	Planning Department letter to Engineer – re: lot size and processing issues;
19 Aug 94	El Dorado Hills Fire Department comments;
19 Aug 94	Salmon Falls Community Advisory Committee comments: concerned with moderate-affordable housing planned for site; opposed to small lots;
24 Aug 94	Environmental Management Department comments;
24 Aug 94	California Department of Fish and Game comments: oaks on the site need to be preserved; building setbacks from creek edge are delineated;
30 Aug 94	Department of Transportation comments: recommends denial of the project; otherwise 23 conditions are provided;
30 Aug 94	Community Services District comments: site map okay; recreation facilities discussed;
21 Sept 94	Technical Advisory Committee meeting: project discussed and continued to next meeting;
26 Sept 94	Technical Advisory Committee meeting: project discussed and continued to next meeting;
28 Sept 94	Department of Transportation comments;
30 Sept 94	California Regional Water Quality Control Board comments: project assessed;
5 Oct 94	Technical Advisory Committee meeting rescheduled: parkland, grading, lot size, and access issues are still unresolved;
1 Nov 94	El Dorado Hills Community Services District comments;
6 Nov 94	Letter of Opposition from the El Dorado County Taxpayers For Quality Growth – re: 2.5 pages of concerns about urbanization and growth in county areas; full EIR requested;
7 Nov 94	LAFCO comments;
16 Nov 94	House plan submittal from Engineer;
29 Nov 94	Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: parkland acreage disagreement;
5 Dec 94	Planning Department memo to file – re: Applicant agrees to submit application for Planned Development Permit and Zone Change due to small lot sizes;
29 Dec 94	Applicant advised by Planning Department to add a Planned Development overlay district to the current zone designation; proposed project is inconsistent with current zoning;
Jan 95	Revisions to tentative map to accommodate parkland dedication;
5 Jan 95	Revised site plans submitted by Engineer;
10 Jan 95	Project routed to agencies for comment on revised tentative map;
13 Jan 95	Site plan revisions made to Engineer's drawings;
20 Jan 95	Department of Transportation comments: conditions forwarded;
8 Feb 95	Fire Department comments: two points of vehicular access and egress to the project site are required; currently only one access point has been provided;
8 Feb 95	El Dorado Union High School District comments: impact fees required;
8 Feb 95	Air Pollution Control District comments: conditions forwarded;
24 Feb 95	Mitigated Negative Declaration revised;
25 Feb 95	Department of Transportation comments: traffic impacts and fees assessed;
3 Mar 95	El Dorado County Indian Council comments;
10 Mar 95	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 27 Apr 95;
20 Mar 95	Parkland Concept Plan submitted by Engineer;
30 Mar 95	Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: responses to Planning Department concerns;
4 Apr 95	Engineer fax to Planning Department – re: access road has been redesigned;
4 Apr 95	Department of Transportation comments: site plan revisions required; bike path required;
18 Apr 95	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 9 May 96;
21 Apr 95	El Dorado Hills Community Service District comments: conditions forwarded;
27 Apr 95	Planning Commission meeting: rezone recommended to County Board of Supervisors; design waivers requested for narrow sidewalks at 4' wide, and for decreased minimum lot sizes approved;

California Department Housing and Community Development

27 Apr 95 Planning Department Staff Report: developer is requesting higher density development on the site due to location next to multi-modal transit facility; early 1980s area plan is now obsolete and should not be consulted—even though the project is consistent with that plan; Planning Department is unsure of the strategy for planning in this area; findings are inconsistent with the General Plan; Planning Department recommends denial of lot size reduction for this project;

6 June 95 Planning Department memo to Board of Supervisors – re: Planning Commission recommends approval of the project and rezone;

13 June 95 County Board of Supervisors meeting: project discussed and continued to next meeting; changes by Planning Commission supported;

13 June 95 Indemnification Agreement signed between Applicant and the County Board of Supervisors;

22 June 95 Board of Supervisors Agenda transmittal: Planning Commission recommends approval of the project with changes;

26 June 95 Letter of Opposition from Harriet B. Siegel – re: general opposition;

27 June 95 County Board of Supervisors meeting: rezone approved; general findings of consistency with General Plan and CEQA requirements; Ordinance No. 4372 adopted for rezone;

10 July 95 Notice of Determination for Mitigated Negative Declaration; EIR already prepared for 201 lot project with 8 landscaped lots; mitigation plan is included;

24 July 95 Applicant letter to County Board of Supervisors – re: thank you for project support; Applicant indicates the project is intended to be an affordable housing project;

early 96 Applicant submits revised phasing and project application;

26 Feb 96 Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: request for comments on final map;

18 Mar 96 Engineer letter to Planning Department – re: revised phasing of project;

12 Apr 96 Project routed to agencies for comment on changes to number of project phases;

16 Apr 96 Planning Department Staff Report for Planning Commission meeting;

16 Apr 96 Planning Commission meeting: project discussed and continued to next meeting;

16 Apr 96 Planning Department letter to County Service Area No. 9 – re: creation of new benefit district for maintaining and improving drainage in the area; will require developer fees per project;

22 Apr 96 El Dorado Hills Fire Department comments;

23 Apr 96 LAFCO comments;

24 Apr 96 Engineer fax to Planning Department – re: notification of \$480 fee payment;

1 May 96 Notice of Restriction - large lots within subdivision;

8 May 96 Parcel map revision submitted: new access road indicated in addition to minor lot changes;

16 May 96 Notice of Restriction - Final Map;

9 May 96 Planning Department Staff Report: phase changes recommended; Applicant requests 4 construction phases rather than 3;

9 May 96 Planning Commission meeting: project approved unanimously; project is re-phased to four distinct construction phases; Tentative Map revised; new conditions supplied by the Planning Department; second access required to Latrobe Road via Golden Foothill Parkway; lots reduced to 200 from 201; indemnification for the county required;

16 July 96 County Board of Supervisors meeting: revised phasing map and project approved; temporary access road indicated; phase boundaries are changed and units are transferred between the various phases;

10 Sept 96 Planning Department letter to Department of Real Estate – re: flood zone designation;

26 Sept 96 Building Permit application submitted for pre-mastering; internal problems with plan check;

3 Nov 96 Notice of Restriction - Lot C open space;

15 Nov 96 Planning Department letter to Department of Real Estate – re: flooding of site;

3 Jan 97 Notice of Restriction - Certificates of Occupancy;

5 Feb 97 Notice of Restriction - School Mitigation: fees of \$7198 per unit paid;

21 Apr 97 First building Permits issued;

California Department Housing and Community Development

10 Dec 97 Planning Department memo to file – re: modifications to Phase II of the parcel map; number of lots reduced to accommodate larger house sizes;
10 Dec 97 Planning Department letter to Placer Development Corp – re: Tentative Map extension to 27 June 99 approved;

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by County: 7 Jan 1994 - 16 July 1996 = 30.25 months
Building Permit Approvals: 26 Sept 1996 - 21 Apr 1997 = 7 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

Minor public opposition to this project was voiced to the Planning Department, Planning Commission and County Board of Supervisors. The El Dorado County Taxpayers for Quality Growth opposed the project on the basis of urbanization in natural resource areas, rather than closer to one of the county's towns. Other objections from residents of the area were also voiced, but closely paralleled the concerns of the taxpayers' group as described above. In addition, various agencies opposed the project and its intentions through the multiple comment periods provided by the Planning Department. Most of these issues were settled however, by including agency concerns, recommendations and mitigation suggestions in the conditions of approval.

CITY of FAIRFIELD:
Vintage Green: single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name:</i>	The Manors at Vintage Green Valley / Creekside Meadow
<i>Location:</i>	SW corner of Green Valley Road and Mangels Road Cordelia area of Fairfield west of Interstate 80
<i>Developer:</i>	Citation Northern, Inc. 597 Center Avenue, Suite 150 Martinez, California 94533 (510) 372 0300 Silverwing Development
<i>Owner:</i>	Same
<i>Project Components:</i>	Phase 1: 91 units on 11.1 acres = 8.2 units/acre 3200 sf min lot size 5 house plans each with 3 elevations house sizes range from 1258 sf - 1930 sf 2 stories @ max 35 ft high 3 and 4 bedroom house plans ea with 2 car garages Phase 2: 120 units on 19.9 acres = 6 units/acre
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	91 unit phase APNs: 148-200-47, 148-200-48, DR 94-35; PD 94-24; TS 94.7 120 unit phase APNs: 148-200-41, 148-200-43 DR 94-34; PD 94-23; TS 94-6

Project Description:

This two phase single-family housing project in the more exclusive Cordelia area of Fairfield was begun in 1994, but was never constructed. The two phases of the project straddle Mangels Road and are adjacent to Green Valley Creek. Although located on vacant agricultural land, the project required a rezoning from Specialty Shopping Center & Public Facility uses to Low / Medium Density Single Family Residential PD use. Approvals were sought and received for both phases of the project at the same time, however the 91 unit first phase was the initial focus of the developer. It was intended that the project would be managed and maintained by a homeowners association and the roads within the project would remain private. The street layout incorporates extensive use of cul-de-sacs with visitor parking bays. Curbside parking is limited to a few streets in the project. The houses were designed with a Mediterranean theme, to be finished with stucco plaster walls, a combination of single-hung and sliding windows, and tile roofs. The facades are dominated by two car garages, shallow porches and numerous layered architectural elements. The side and rear elevations are flat. Most of the units have minimal front- and backyards. The project has recently been sold to another developer, who has changed the name of the project from the Manors to Creekside Meadow and intends to seek building permits by October 1998 before the planning approvals expire. The original developer never sought building permits due to inopportune market conditions and the relatively high development fees in the Cordelia area.

California Department Housing and Community Development

Planning and Development Issues:

The project is located in the Cordelia Specific Plan Area and required several approvals and amendments, including: General and Specific Plan amendments, rezoning, a PUD permit, TSM approval, and Design Review Commission, Planning Commission and City Council approvals. Because of its location near a creek and wetland area it also required a series of environmental permits / delineations from the US Army Corps of Engineers, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the State Water Quality Control Board. The project was originally designated within the 100 year flood plain, but with grading and new fill to change the level of development the designation was dropped by FEMA. The project received opposition from the Green Valley Landowners Association (GVLA) due to disagreement over the rezoning, increasing densities and creeping urbanization. Late in the approvals process, an archaeological report was delivered that indicated the presence of a prehistoric house, an Indian midden and artifacts on the site that would require special attention and the presence of an archaeologist on site.

Key Project Adjustments:

The developer initially wanted 93 units in the Phase I development, but this was reduced to 91 units with the required addition of a tot lot on two of the lots. In meeting with staff and GVLA, the applicant was forced to reduce 9 units along Green Valley Road from two-story to one-story houses and increase a 6' masonry sound wall to 8' high around each phase. The minimum lot size was increased to 3200 sf from 3000 sf. Design Review Commission and planning Department staff forced aesthetic material changes on the developer that included: built-up foam trim around the windows, extensions of veneers around corners, sectional and varied garage door designs, more ornamental street light fixtures, increased landscaping, and aggregate finishes for driveway paving. The developer also became responsible for local road improvements on the adjacent collector roads.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

3 Nov 94	Planning Application;
3 Nov 94	Property Subdivision Application;
3 Nov 94	Public Hearing Notice to adjacent property owners—re: Development Review;
12 Dec 94	Planning Department Environmental Assessment Form;
21 Dec 94	\$7402 subdivision application fee paid;
24 Jan 95	Fire Prevention Division Comments received;
5 Feb 95	Public Hearing Notice—re: Development Review, PUD permit, Tent. Subdivision Map;
15 Feb 95	Design Review Commission Meeting: both phases approved with minor changes; it recommends swimming pools in both project phases—but defers this issue to the Planning Commission. GVLA expresses opposition to the project rezoning due to perception of high density and encroaching urbanization;
16 Feb 95	Public Hearing Notice—re: continuation;
8 Mar 95	Planning Commission Meeting: where the following exhibits were presented: Exhibit A: Mitigated Negative Declaration recommendation by Planning Department staff; Exhibit B: General Plan diagram amendment proposals; Exhibit C: Cordelia Area Specific Plan amendment proposals; Exhibit D: rezoning proposals for project properties; and Exhibit E: Tentative Subdivision Map conditions of approval. Also at this meeting, Resolution 95-16 was presented to approve all of the above, however no decision was taken—continued to next meeting due to on-going discussions between applicant, staff and GVLA;
2 Apr 95	Public Hearing Notice—re: continuation of discussion;
3 Apr 95	Meeting with staff, GVLA, and applicants: some adjustments made to project—sound wall increased in height; GVLA requests \$66,000 exaction to be donated to community service providers or public art;
12 Apr 95	Planning Commission Meeting: no decision—continued to next meeting;

California Department Housing and Community Development

24 Apr 95	Planning Department CEQA initial checklist: File # ER 94-41 and 94-42; mitigations required for: archaeology, wetlands;
24 Apr 95	Swimming pool budgets delivered to Planning Department
26 Apr 95	Planning Commission Meeting: attempt to adopt Resolution 95-16 allowing all permits and amendments, but only some are adopted: rezoning of 120 unit phase, mitigated neg. dec., Cordelia Specific Plan amendments, Tentative Subdivision Map, PUD permit, and Development Review area all approved. Swimming pools not required. General Plan amendments and rezoning of 93 unit phase continued to next meeting;
10 May 95	Planning Commission Meeting: staff requests continuation to next meeting;
23 May 95	Letter of protest from resident to Planning Department—re: impacted schools and lack of commercial uses;
24 May 95	Planning Commission Meeting: no decision—continued to next meeting;
30 May 95	Meeting with staff, GVLA, and applicants: some adjustments made to project--setbacks increased, new one story house plan added. The applicant refuses to pay \$66K exaction and decides to let Planning Commission decide this issue;
14 June 95	Planning Commission Meeting: no decision—continued to next meeting;
20 June 95	Meeting with staff, GVLA, and applicants: follow up to previous meeting; memorandum of understanding agreed and incorporated into conditions of approval;
20 June 95	Fairfield City Council Meeting: Resolution 95-128 passed and signed by Mayor/ City Council approving 120 unit phase;
28 June 95	Planning Commission Meeting: no decision—continued to next meeting;
12 July 95	Planning Commission Meeting: Applicants present redesigned project with agreed changes. Resolution 95-16 passed by unanimous vote of commission--all remaining amendments, permits and rezonings approved; Conditions of Approval adopted; Phase I reduced to 91 units from 93 with addition of tot lot; No \$66K exaction to GVLA required;
25 July 95	Fairfield City Council Meeting: Resolution 95-16 passed for full project;
1 Aug 95	Fairfield City Council Meeting: Resolution 95-177 passed and signed by Mayor/City Council approving development review, permits and TSM;
5 Sep 95	Fairfield City Council Meeting: Resolution 95-18—second reading passed and signed by Mayor/City Council approving all requirements; Project officially effective.
26 Oct 95	Archaeological Report: prehistoric house floor noted—requires archaeologist on site to monitor grading and utility trenching. Any unique features are to be fully excavated, exposed and documented. Allows mechanical grading down to 30-40 centimeters with hand excavation below that level. Extensive instructions on grading, trenching, and soil removal.
30 Dec 97	Final Map submitted by Citation.
Apr 98	The project has been sold to a new developer—Silverwing Development.
Aug 98	No building permits have been issued, however Silverwing is under pressure to file for 50-60 of the 91 units prior to October 1998 since 61 housing allotments were scheduled to expire through the Cordelia Housing Allocation System. The developer could only seek building permits for this partial number since the Cordelia area was under a housing allocation system for growth management purposes;
Aug 98	Building Permit Application submitted;
5-13 Oct 98	24 Building Permits issued;
19 Nov 98	City Council repeals the Cordelian Housing Allocation System.

Total Time for Approvals:

Planning Approvals:	3 Nov 1994 - 5 Sep 1995 = 10 months
Building Permit Approvals:	Aug 1998 - 5 Oct 1998 = 2 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received vocal opposition from the Green Valley Landowners Association (GVLA) and other residents who wrote letters to the Planning Department.

CITY of FREMONT:
Vintage Grove: single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name:</i>	Vintage Grove
<i>Project Location:</i>	45554 Antelope Drive, Fremont California 94539 North-east corner of Mission Boulevard & Stanford Lane In the hills south-east of central Fremont
<i>Developer:</i>	SummerHill Homes 777 California Ave. Palo Alto, California 94304 Tel: (415) 857-0122 Fax: (415) 857-1077
<i>Owner:</i>	Frederick Weibel
<i>Project Components:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-191 total units on 89.2 acres (gross) = 2.1 units/acre (gross)-five construction phases-four lot types:-4 estate lots from 1.5-4.9 acres for custom homes, to be left in natural state except for 1 acre (max.)-6 lots at 1/3 acre each for custom homes, sited to relate better with surrounding development-11 lots at 1/3 acre each-170 lots at 10,000 sf each (approx) for production homes, typ. 85' x 120'-6 floor plans with 2 elevations each-2 stories max.-production house sizes range from 1,900 sf - 3,700 sf, all 4 BR
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	P-94-3, EIA-94-68, SA-94-2, GP-94-12
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Planning: The Frisbie Planning Company Architecture: Mark Rethford Landscape Architecture: Tom Baak Civil Engineering: Peter McMorro Civil Engineering Assoc.

Project Description:

This project involved the development of a large site (89.2 acres) for single family residences. Formerly the site of the Weibel Winery, the land was in agricultural use surrounded by single family detached residential developments. There were three buildings on the site associated with the winery, including one residence, one dilapidated barn, and a brick building. There had already been a residential subdivision (172 sf units) planned and approved for the land in the late 1980s. However, the developer at the time, the Sagwa Development Corporation, chose not to go ahead with the plan because it was not economically feasible to do so. After Sagwa pulled out, the City met with 25 other developers to see if they would take over the project. Eventually, SummerHill Homes, the developer of the current project, proceeded with a plan to develop 191 units as an “up-scale, large lot residential community consistent with the surrounding area’s residential development, with open space and historical amenities”. The development included four lot types and six floor plans, along with the preservation of some of the historic buildings on the site, and park facilities. The street layout made heavy use of cul-de-sacs aligned so as to promote views of the Bay, although these had pedestrian walk-throughs at their heads to promote circulation.

California Department Housing and Community Development

Other features of the development include five foot wide planter strips between the roads and the sidewalks, and the retention of many of the site's olive trees. Parks were to be dedicated to the city and maintained through a Lighting and Landscape Maintenance District (LLMD). Building permits began to be issued in July 1995 and the project is still under construction.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project received a Planned District designation and went through the normal approvals process. This was expedited by the fact that a similar residential development had already been approved for the site, so no rezoning or General Plan amendment was required, and only an Addendum to the existing EIA was required, which found that the project had no significant environmental impacts. The developer had to pay amenity fees of \$208,000 because the development had 13 more units than allowed by the Step 1 density of 2.0 units/acre. There was some neighborhood opposition to the project, particularly with regard to: density, lack of neighborhood cohesion, lack of recreational amenities, widening of streets, the size of the homes, impacts on local schools, traffic, and the location of easements for road realignments. SummerHill Homes picked up the agreement that had been negotiated between the Fremont Unified School District and the Sagwa Development Corp. which involved a \$1.58 / sf charge for schools.

Key Project Adjustments:

There were relatively few revisions required of the development during the approvals process, although there were many conditions (14 pages) for the final project approval. These conditions were met by the developer. Throughout the development process there were negotiations regarding the orientation of the homes on the perimeter of the project (outward orientation was chosen), the height of a masonry sound wall along Mission Blvd. (settled at 6 feet), and the designation of open space within the project as park land (the city would not accept dedicated lands for parks in lieu of fees). There were also concerns on the part of the city regarding the grading of hillside lots and a 21 foot wide easement of the south side of the development (which was later redesigned, and removed). The city also required the undergrounding of all utilities along Mission Blvd and Stanford Ave, and the installation of traffic signals at that intersection. In addition, the city required SummerHill to abandon the Vineyard Rd. right of way, which ran through the project site. SummerHill Homes had to revise its plans regarding the realignment of Stanford Rd. because of the unwillingness of neighboring property owners to sell their land for an easement.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

Dec 93	Application for Planned District designation;
2 Feb 94	Community meeting held by developer;
7 Feb 94	Letter from SummerHill to neighbors of Stanford Ave. asking 9 to sell land for road realignment;
22 Feb 94	Letter from "Neighbors of Weibel Winery" to SummerHill Homes declining to sell land for Stanford Rd. realignment;
11 Mar 94	Letter from SummerHill to neighbors clarifying land required for road realignment, with design change, 7 instead of 9 being asked to sell;
15 Mar 94	Letter from SummerHill to Planning Department. saying that a neighbor (one of the 9 above) will be writing to the City to oppose the development because of road realignment, noise, traffic, and having homes face his rear yard;
18 Apr 94	Planning application for the project received;
18 Apr 94	EI Questionnaire and Application;
19 Apr 94	Letter from property owner (Weibel) declaring ownership and permitting studies to be done on the property;
19 Apr 94	Letter from property owner declaring to be bound by rules of PD, and that records will be filed with the County;

California Department Housing and Community Development

19 Apr 94	Letter from SummerHill to Planning Department indicating that they are choosing to combine preliminary site plan and precise site plan to expedite PD application and that they are aware of the risks of doing so prior to Council's approval of the development concept;
4 May 94	Statement of no hazardous wastes on site;
9 May 94	Letter from Planning Department to SummerHill indicating receipt of application and notifying them re: dates of meeting at Development Services (June 1) and Planning Commission (June 23);
9 May 94	Letter from Planning Department. to other City/County/private departments and agencies informing them of the development and requesting comments;
15 May 94	Wetland Report by H.T. Harvey & Assoc. Jurisdictional waters delineated by US Army Corps of Engineers, 1.02 acres of site delineated wetland, 0.04 acres of jurisdiction tributary, USACE permit required;
19 May 94	AC Transit comments; no substantive changes required;
June 94	Storm Water Detention Report by Schaaf & Wheeler Consulting Civil Engineers; two detention basins required;
June 94	Noise report; discusses noise impacts and requires masonry wall on Mission Blvd;
1 June 94	Preliminary review meeting between applicant and Development Services staff, some revisions requested (see above), planning staff support granting of PD designation;
16 June 94	Letter from SummerHill to Planning Department. re: updating of soil study;
23 June 94	Draft Negative Declaration with Mitigations; two retention basins required by Flood Control District, two on-site historic buildings to be preserved, no surface evidence of prehistoric cultural artifacts, development impact fees required by the City; EIA Initial Study indicates no significant environmental impacts;
23 June 94	Letter from Planning Department to other agencies soliciting comments;
24 June 94	Letter from Alameda Public Works Agency re: development proposal; project subject to National Pollution Discharge Elimination System requirement, project requires permit for encroachment on APWA land and ROWs, and other possible requirements;
1 July 94	Letter from SummerHill to Planning Department responding to requests for more information re: roads, LLMD fees, costs of bringing historic buildings up to UBC standards;
14 July 94	Planning Commission meeting; project application continued until 28 July 94
15 July 94	Letter from Planning Department. to SummerHill notifying them of continuation of application to July 28 at Planning Commission meeting (July 14);
19 July 94	Fax from Fremont Unified School District (FUSD) to Planning Department re: School Facility Agreement reached between FUSD and Sagwa Development Corporation on Sept. 19, 1989. \$1.56 / sf to be paid to FUSD by developer;
21 July 94	Fax from Dahlin Group (project architect) re: architectural styles to be used in project
21 July 94	Letter from nearby resident to Planning Department raising concerns re: impact of development on schools and re: traffic safety;
23 July 94	Public Hearing notification published;
27 July 94	Letter from Fremont Leisure Services Director to Planning Department. re: park designation and fees for project;
27 July 94	Letter from Vineyard Height Homeowners Association to Planning Commission opposing the development on the following grounds: density, neighborhood cohesion, recreation, widening of streets, size of homes, school impacts, and easements;
28 July 94	Planning Commission meeting; project recommended to City Council for approval;
2 Aug 94	Letter from Vineyard Heights Homeowners Association to City Council opposing the development, threatening legal action if development approved;
2 Aug 94	City Council meeting. At public hearing 37 people speak about the project. Council approves the project with conditions (14 pages), EIA Addendum found to be complete, project conforms to General Plan, project meets municipal codes;
25 Aug 94	Planning Commission meeting; approval of Vesting Tentative Tract Map, Preliminary Grading Plan; street abandonment recommended to Council for approval;
25 Aug 94	Project Summary and Bill for City costs sent to SummerHill; \$14,514.78 - \$ \$5,150 deposit paid;

California Department Housing and Community Development

6 Sep 94	City Council approves project on second reading, waives full reading of Ord. 1888;
7 Sep 94	Notice of Determination. EIA 94-68 certified with mitigated negative declaration;
24 Sep 94	EIR 88-69 certified as complete and accurate, incorporated into General Plan;
5 Jan 95	Letter from SummerHill to Development Services indicating how Conditions for Approval have been addressed;
30 Jan 95	First applications for master building permits, (45554 Antelope Dr.);
22 Jun 95	First building permits issued, (45554 Antelope Dr.);
25 Oct 95	Feasibility Analysis for historic Weibel buildings including Scope of Work;
25 Apr 96	First Certificate of Occupancy issued, (45554 Antelope Dr.);
4 Apr 97	Letter from SummerHill to Planning Department re: cost of relocating olive tree, re: concerns of a nearby resident;
Aug 98	Project still in construction, building permits still being pulled for various phases of the development; most units completed with occupancy permits.

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	18 Apr 1994 – 6 Sep 1994 = 4.75 months
Building Permit Approval:	30 Jan 1995 -- 22 Jun 1995 = 4.75+ months (typical)
Building Construction Period:	22 Jun 1995 -- 25 Apr 1996 = 10 months (typical per unit)

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project encountered substantial public opposition from community groups in the area, who were opposed to various aspects of the project.

CITY of FRESNO:
Sommerville & Granville Estates: single-family subdivision

Project Name: Sommerville & Granville Estates at Shepherd Ranch

Project Location: in southwest and northeast quads
of East Perrin Avenue and North Chestnut Avenue
in northeast Fresno

Developer: Granville Homes, Inc.
1396 W. Herndon Avenue, No. 101, Fresno California 93711
209 436 0900

Owner: Same

Project Components:

- 439 residential lots on 123.49 acres = 3.55 du/ac;
- total project area @ 131.19 acres
- 2 small remainders near intersection at 7.7 acres
- project in 6 marketing phases
 - phase 1a: 116 lots; 30.22 acres; 3.84 du/ac; tract no. 4759
 - phase 1b: 96 lots; 28.92 acres; 3.32 du/ac; tract no. 4759
 - phase 2: 36 lot PUD; 11.94 acres; 3 du/ac; tract no. 4780
 - phase 3: 69 lots; 20.10 acres; 3.43 du/ac; tract no. 4781
 - phases 4 & 5: 122 lots; 32.31 acres; 3.76 du/ac; tract no. 4833
- lot sizes range from 6000 sf - 14,500 sf
- no community amenities or recreation centers on site
- three housing series thus far (models listed are basic with no upgrades or flex options)

Sommerville at Shepherd Ranch: phase 1a; 9 house plans

- plan 1 - Bodega: 3 bdrm / 2 ba / 2 car garage @ 1400 sf
- plan 2 - St. Helena: 3 bdrm / 2 ba / 3 car garage @ 1475 sf
- plan 3 - Sutter: 3 bdrm / 2 ba / 3 car garage @ 1705 sf
- plan 4 - Saratoga: 3-4 bdrm / 2 ba / 3 car garage @ 1865 sf
- plan 5 - Sonoma: 4 bdrm / 2 ba / 3 car garage @ 1945 sf
- plan 6 - Penngrove: 4 bdrm / 2 ba / 2 car garage @ 2000 sf
- plan 7 - Trenton: 4 bdrm / 2 ba / 2 car garage @ 2030 sf
- plan 8 - Napa: 4 bdrm / 2 ba / 3 car garage @ 2055 sf
- plan 9 - Rutherford: 4 bdrm / 3 ba / 3 car garage @ 2635 sf

-price range: \$123,950 - \$ 185,450

-all one story, except for 2 story Rutherford model

-7 Sommerville Models located at: 2368, 2371, 2372, 2387, 2388, 2403 and 2404 East Pryor

Granville Estates: Gallery Collection: phase 1b; 5 house plans

- plan 1 - Monet: 3 bdrm / 2 ba / 3 car garage @ 1930 sf
- plan 2 - Van Gogh: 4 bdrm / 2 ba / 3 car garage @ 1945 sf
- plan 3 - Picasso: 3 bdrm / 2 ba / 3 car garage @ 2185 sf
- plan 4 - Renoir: 4 bdrm / 2 ba / 3 car gar. @ 2270 sf
- plan 5 -Rembrandt: 3 bdrm+study / 2.5 ba / 3 car gar @ 2970 sf

California Department Housing and Community Development

-price range: \$161,950 - \$219,450

-all one story, except for 2 story Rembrandt

Granville Estates: Masters Collection: phase 1b; 5 house plans

-plan 1 - Matisse: 4 bdrm / 2 ba / 3 car garage @ 2485 sf

-plan 2 - Donatello: 3-4 bdrm / 2.5 ba / 3 car garage @ 2830 sf

-plan 3 - Marin: 4 bdrm / 2 ba / 3 car garage @ 2695 sf

-plan 4 - Da Vinci: 5 bdrm / 3 ba / 3 car garage @ 3515 sf

-plan 5 - Michelangelo: 5 bdrm / 2.5-3.5 ba / 3 car gar. @ 3630 sf

-price range: \$188,950 - \$247,950

-all one story, except for 2 story Da Vinci & Michelangelo

Project Numbers:

APNs: 568-020-33, -46; 401-060-03, -16, -44

Tentative Tract Maps: 4759, 4780, 4781, and 4833

Urban Growth Management Permits: 578, 610

General Plan Amendment: A-92-18

Conditional Use Permits: 95-116 (for PUD phase); 97-248

Rezoning: RZ 92-46, RZ 95-36

Mitigated Negative Declaration: 98-08

EIRs: 10117 (Project), 10100 (Community Plan)

Project Consultants:

Civil Engineering: Edward D. Dunkel & Associates

Project Description:

This housing subdivision is located in the far northeast corner of Fresno, approximately 10 miles from the city center. The project site is located in the southwest and northeast quadrants of the intersection of East Perrin Avenue and North Sommerville Drive. It is located on a site completely surrounded by single family subdivisions in all directions except the northeast, which is vacant land, and to the south where a Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District basin serving the general community is located. The topography of the site is flat, which adds to drainage and flood control problems.

The project site is roughly cruciform in shape along the north-south axis, coming to a point at the northeast end. East Perrin Avenue forms the southern border of the east-west axis, with Sommerville Drive curving through the site from the northwest and forming the east boundary to the south. Two remainder parcels have been left in the northwest and southeast quadrants of the project site. These parcels have been zoned for residential uses, but will probably end up as commercial sites.

The street layouts of the various phases are virtually identical across the project site. Each phase is dominated by a single loop road with just a few internal or external cul-de-sacs to either side. The lots are deep and narrow, which will result in garage dominant house plans.

Three housing series are offered at the current time. Two model home centers have been opened with a large number of models in each center. The Sommerville model center and housing series is located in the southernmost phase of the project. The model center for this center is serving double duty as the model center for another off-site subdivision by Granville Homes to the south of the flood control basin. The model center for both Granville Estates series are located just north of the intersection of Perrin Avenue and Sommerville Drive. Each series is targeted at a different market segment, although the house sizes seem to be similar in the Sommerville series and the Gallery Collection.

The houses are designed in a contemporary suburban style with Mediterranean overtones, although other finishes and veneers are provided as options. They are finished with stucco plaster, concrete flat and Spanish tile roofs, brick and masonry veneers on the front facade, aluminum sash and sliding windows, inoperable wood shutters and fascias, built-up foam and stucco plaster trim, arches, decorative columns, and roll up garage doors. Of note on

some of the models are options for concealed side entry garages. The front doors tend to be set back on most of the models with symbolic raised entry elements to signal the location of the entry.

As of September 1998 most of the 116 lots of the Sommerville tract have been sold and constructed. Interestingly enough, of those remaining lots only the smaller models remain; the larger house plans in the Sommerville tract were preferred by buyers and sold out much earlier. The Granville Estates tracts are just beginning sales in all of the other tracts across the northern part of the subdivision. The PUD has not yet begun construction.

Planning and Development Issues:

The entitlements process for this project was extremely lengthy and protracted. The project was processed linearly, with the General Plan Amendment, Rezone and EIR certification processed prior to the tract map and other project specific approvals. While the actual project entitlements took about a half year, the earlier land use designation and environmental approvals took about one and half years. Part of these early approvals included the adoption of a community plan for the Woodward Park area in northeast Fresno, which includes the project area. The developer was not required to fund production of this EIR however, only the EIR for the specific project—both of which seem to have been processed at the same time.

The entitlements process was also extended by a second round of hearings and approvals for a tract map revision and redesign of the last construction phase. The number of lots in this tract was increased by 49 lots from 73 to 122. A completely different application and approvals process was required. Fortunately, much of the project analysis had already occurred through the larger project's previous approvals and did not have to be repeated.

The project required a variety of approvals, including: annexation of certain county land parcels to the city, several tract maps, conditional use permits for a gated PUD at the center of the project site and for private streets in the later tract map revision, Urban Growth Management Permits, and Rezones. The project required a zone change from county land, agricultural and grazing use, and some single family land use designations (AE-20 and R-1/UGM) to a single family land use designation (all R-1/UGM). The UGM suffix after the zone designation refers to participation in the city's urban growth management plan, with associated permit applications and fees. Prior to development the land was vacant and flat grazing land, with a large dirt pile to one side.

Environmental analysis for the project was covered in the certification of project EIR No. 10117. A project related Mitigation and Monitoring Plan was included in this EIR. The later tract map revision was tiered off this earlier EIR and received a Mitigated Negative Declaration. Only a few moderate environmental impacts arose with this project, including: surface drainage problems, air quality, and public service provisions. There were few planning problems with this project, save for the provision of adequate drainage and infrastructure to the project site by the developer.

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers and agencies were minimal and provided for few project additions. The Development Department included extensive requirements in the conditions of approval. These conditions are detailed below. The city includes all agency requirements in distinct sections of the conditions of approval, separated from the general conditions supplied by the major Development Department divisions. This tends to provide for an enormous number of conditions, fees and steps in the development process in Fresno.

Deviation from street standards and lot depths for a few lots were requested by the developer and granted by the Development Department Director subsequent to the project approvals. These approvals were relatively rapid with no public review.

The only change in the lot count was initiated by the developer through submission of a tract map revision application. The public agencies did not request any lot reductions.

California Department Housing and Community Development

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

Apr 94	EIR No. 10117 issued for site;
8 May 94	City Council meeting: certifies EIR No. 10117 for previous project and EIR No. 10100 certified for Woodward Park Community Plan; discusses General Plan Amendment: A-92-18 and Rezone 92-46 for previous unconstructed approved;
8 Feb 95	Planning Commission meeting: adoption of GPA A-92-18 and rezone 92-46 recommended to City Council; mitigation measures per the EIRs approved;
21 Mar 95	City Council meeting: General Plan Amendment: A-92-18 approved;
mid-Sept 95	Application submitted for current project;
26 Sept 95	Development Department verification check list and review of site plan issues;
20 Nov 95	Public Works Engineering Division comments: fees of \$66,485 required;
13 Dec 95	Public Works fees are paid;
15 Dec 95	Applicant letter to Development Department – re: letter of agency for Farid Assemi;
15 Dec 95	Project routed to agencies for comment;
20 Dec 95	Electricity Division comments; none;
21 Dec 95	Department of Transportation comments: regional impact fees are suggested;
26 Dec 95	Fire Department comments: standard;
27 Dec 95	Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District comments: drainage facilities to be constructed by the developer, in addition to a fee to the city;
28 Dec 95	Solid Waste Division comments: none;
28 Dec 95	Public Works comments: apportionment fee of \$1930 required;
28 Dec 95	Fresno Irrigation District comments: requirement for underground piping of existing canals that cross the property;
28 Dec 95	Parks, Recreation and Community Service Department comments: street trees required @ one per lot or 1 per 60' street frontage; project must be fully landscaped and irrigated;
28 Dec 95	Preliminary Subdivision Review Committee meeting: comments provided to Applicant prior to application submittal
28 Dec 95	Department of Utilities comments: various physical changes and requirements added: several pipelines and water mains required across site;
3 Jan 96	Planning Commission meeting: plan amendments discussed and adopted;
4 Jan 96	Public Works Engineering Division comments: 28 standard conditions submitted; connection to city infrastructure required;
4 Jan 96	Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District comments: notice of requirements with fee request for \$665,953;
4 Jan 96	Clovis Unified School District comments: fees of \$1.72 /sf required;
4 Jan 96	Subdivision Review Committee meeting: project reviewed and rejected due to nonconformance with plans and policies of the city; too many street standard deviations; many public improvements required;
10 Jan 96	Development Department letter to Engineer – re: notification of Subdivision Review Committee meeting decision;
10 Jan 96	Department of Utilities comments: “will not serve” letter for sewer and water service; facilities not available in area;
16 Jan 96	City Council meeting: General Plan Amendment discussed and continued to next meeting;
22 Jan 96	Public Works comments: project street improvements must adjust county roads and through roads; project area must be annexed to the city prior to the tract map approvals;
24 Jan 96	Revised tentative map submitted;
26 Jan 96	Tentative subdivision map submitted;
31 Jan 96	Fees paid for additional tentative subdivision map;
31 Jan 96	Development Department fees required: \$2079 for tract map amendment;
9 Feb 96	Revised tentative map submitted;

California Department Housing and Community Development

9 Feb 96	Revised site plan submitted;
14 Feb 96	Development Department Building Division letter to Applicant – re: appeal procedure notification for utilities “will not serve” letter;
16 Feb 96	Project routed to agencies for comment; due back by 6 Mar 96;
20 Feb 96	Development Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of Mitigated Negative Declaration recommendation for project;
20 Feb 96	Public Utilities Water Division comments: recharge water problems on site; project may require payment of surface water impact fees;
21 Feb 96	Planning Commission meeting: project discussed; minor changes to conditions of approval; continued to next meeting;
23 Feb 96	Engineer letter to Development Department – re: waiver of the appeal period for sewer and water findings;
25 Feb 96	Initial Study completed for project; no significant impacts noted on project; moderate environmental impacts noted on: air quality, availability of public services, surface ground water and pollution issues;
27 Feb 96	Public Works comments: general conditions submitted;
27 Feb 96	Urban Growth Management Application submitted: project at 390 units;
undated	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 6 Mar 96;
6 Mar 96	Staff Report to Planning Commission: minimal findings included; no project specific findings;
6 Mar 96	Planning Commission meeting: project approved: several resolutions passed for the various required approvals; project approved at 390 units; 80 general conditions of approval, including: annexation to the city, street dedications and easements, fees for various impacts and assessment districts, a “right to farm” covenant for adjacent uses, CC&Rs to be reviewed by city, participation in a Landscape, Lighting and Maintenance District, extensive off-site street improvements, water and sewer line improvements, and undergrounding of all utilities; all memos and requirements of other agencies listed separately from general conditions of approval and are mandated as project conditions; no opposition to project voiced; unanimous approval of all resolutions;
18 Mar 96	Development Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of Planning Commission approval;
26 Mar 96	City Council meeting: rezone introduced;
1 Apr 96	Applicant letter to Development Department – re: request for refund of tract map amendment fee of \$2079; decided not to proceed with amendment;
9 Apr 96	City Council meeting: rezone adopted in Ordinance Bill No. 96-28;
19 Feb 97	Tract Map 4780 for 36 unit PUD submitted by Engineer;
17 Mar 97	Minor Deviation Application fee paid of \$635.50 + tract map revision fee of \$235.75;
2 Apr 97	Revised tract maps submitted;
7 Apr 97	Revised tract map 4759 submitted;
11 Apr 97	Development Department Director approves tract map revision;
11 Apr 97	Tract map revisions routed to agencies for comment;
15 Apr 97	Development Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of Director’s decision on the tract map revision for tract 4759;
7 May 97	Staff Report to Planning Commission: revised tract map to reduce required lot depth and frontage for several lots of tract 4759;
30 May 97	Applicant letter to Development Department – re: fee clarification requested;
31 May 97	Meeting between Applicant and Development Department to discuss fees;
26 June 97	Categorical exemption from Environmental Assessment approved for changes to be made to North Chestnut Avenue through the project site;
21 July 97	Subdivision Agreement between Applicant and City for tract 4759; includes agreements on developer provision of public improvements, dedications, security bonding, CC&Rs — and mandates construction deadline of 31 Dec 99;
1 Oct 97	Application submitted for revisions to previous entitlements; tract map 4833 submitted to replace 73 lots of previous phase 4 with 122 lots for new phase 4 and 5;

California Department Housing and Community Development

3 Oct 97 Verification check list completed by Planning Division;

14 Nov 97 Planning Division letter to Applicant – re: application deemed complete;

17 Nov 97 Project routed to agencies for comment;

26 Nov 97 Department of Utilities comments: sewer and water services not available; developer will have to install services for subdivision;

26 Nov 97 Clovis Unified School District comments: \$1.84 / sf fees required;

1 Dec 97 Fire Department comments; standard;

2 Dec 97 Department of Utilities comments: water and sewer mains required;

2 Dec 97 Fresno Irrigation District comments;

4 Dec 97 Solid Waste Division comments;

4 Dec 97 Subdivision Review Committee meeting; project reviewed and recommended to Planning Commission;

5 Dec 97 PG&E comments: 10' easement request;

5 Dec 97 Public Works Engineering Division comments: public improvements detailed;

9 Dec 97 Development Department letter to Applicant – re: appeal procedure notification for utilities “will not serve” letter;

10 Dec 97 Engineer letter to Development Department – re: waiver of the appeal period for sewer and water findings;

11 Dec 97 Subdivision Review Committee meeting;

11 Dec 97 Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District comments: notice of requirements;

17 Dec 97 Initial Study for Environmental Assessment: moderated environmental impacts noted; similar to previous IA; Mitigated Negative Declaration recommended;

18 Dec 97 Public Works conditions forwarded;

19 Dec 97 Urban Growth Management Permit application submitted;

19 Dec 97 Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission and City Council meetings;

19 Dec 97 Subdivision Agreement between Applicant and City for tract 4780; similar to previous agreement;

2 Jan 98 Public Works comments: fees of \$592 per acre required for construction of median islands; apportionment fee of \$1660 required; project must be annexed to Community Facilities District No. 2;

5 Jan 98 Internal memo: Planning Division questions the above fees from the Public Works Department;

6 Jan 98 Applicant letter to Development Department – re: agreement to annex project to Community Facilities District No. 2;

7 Jan 98 Department of Utilities letter to Development Department – re: will serve letter for sewer and water services;

7 Jan 98 Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department comments: conditions of approval forwarded;

7 Jan 98 Staff Report to Planning Commission: rezone explained; conditions included;

7 Jan 98 Planning Commission meeting: tract map 4833 approved; several resolutions passed; 74 general conditions of approval attached to project along with various agency comments and requirements; no public opposition; unanimous approval;

13 Jan 98 Tract 4780 Subdivision Agreement signed by both parties;

14 Jan 98 Development Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of Planning Commission approval;

26 Jan 98 Staff Report to City Council;

10 Feb 98 City Council meeting: project approved; Ordinance Bill for rezone approved; Mitigated Negative Declaration certified;

17 Feb 98 Development Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of City Council rezone approval;

Aug 98 Sommerville nearing build-out; Granville just beginning to sell.

California Department Housing and Community Development

Total Time for Approvals:

GPA, rezone & EIR certification by City:	late 1993 - 19 Mar 1995 = 18 months approx.
Project Approval by City:	mid Sept 1995 - 9 Apr 1996 = 6.75 months
Project Revision Approval by City:	1 Oct 1997 - 10 Feb 1998 = 4.25 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

No public opposition to the project was voiced at any of the public hearings.

CITY of LOS ANGELES:
Belcourt: single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name:</i>	Belcourt Little League Tract / Bernson Hall Complex
<i>Project Location:</i>	northeast corner of Devonshire Street and Wilbur Avenue in Northridge area of San Fernando Valley model at 10325 Edgebrook Way
<i>Developer:</i>	Devonshire-Northridge LP (land developer) 16830 Ventura Boulevard, Encino California 91436 Premier Homes (home builder) 2280 Wardlow Circle Ste. 250, Corona California 91720 909 272 8111 818 366 0378 (marketing office @ models) Novak & Associates 108 N. Brand No. 201, Glendale California 91203 818 500 0457
<i>Owner:</i>	Overland Co. / Overland National Land Fund 147 East Olive Avenue, Monrovia California 91016 818 358 5888
<i>Project Components:</i>	-44 residential lots, 2 street lots, 1 recreation lot + 2 landscape lots -24.4 total acres -11.6 acres residential to the west + 12.8 acres recreational to east -44 total units on 11.6 residential acres = 3.79 units per acre -lot sizes range from 7516 sf to 13,396 sf -avg. lot size = approx. 9000 sf -no house plan information included in the project file; -streetside parking throughout the development -no residential recreational facilities included -little league complex includes: 7 fields, existing parking lot, and an existing one story accessory building with restrooms. -streets in the residential portion are to be private
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	Tentative Tract Map 52135 General Plan Amendment Zoning Administration w/ Yard Variance: ZA 96-0361 (YV) City Planning Commission: CPC 95-0416 Mitigated Negative Declaration: MND 95-0357
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Crouse / Beers & Associates, Inc. Planning Consultant: Comprehensive Land Use Planning/ Mgmt Architecture: Kristen Maher Structural Engineer: Esi / Fme Inc.

Project Description:

This housing subdivision is located in the Northridge section of Los Angeles in the northern San Fernando Valley. The project site consists of two main land uses: 11.6 acres of residential use to the west and 12.8 acres of recreational use (7 little league diamonds) to the east. To the north of the project site are single family residences in Tract 44605; to the south are Devonshire Street and more single family residential uses in Tract 17404; to the east are single family residences in Tract 25538 and commercial uses along Devonshire; and to the west across Wilbur Avenue are single family residences in Tracts 24416 to the northwest and Tracts 19194 and 22013 to the southwest. A single vehicular access point from Wilbur Drive enters at the center of the residential site to a single loop road that circles the development. All 44 residential lots are located to either side of this loop road. There are no internal cul-de-sacs in this development. An emergency access stub road has been located in the southeast corner of the residential development, leading to the parking lot of the Bernson / Hall Little League complex to the east of the residential lots.

The Bernson / Hall Little League complex was already existing on the site prior to the application for residential development. The complex consists of 7 little league diamonds of various dimensions, an asphalt parking lot at the corner of Devonshire and the Wilbur Creek Channel, and a centrally located single story accessory building that houses equipment rooms and restrooms. The little league site is to remain intact, with the residential development virtually independent from it. Only the emergency access road connects the two uses in the southwest corner of the Bernson / Hall Complex.

The lots are large and should provide ample front and back yards. No housing information was included in the project file during the approvals process. The developer intends to assign the development to a home builder later in the project—which was completed in 1997 to Premier Homes of Corona.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project is within Northridge Community Plan area. As an official component of the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles, the Northridge Community Plan designated the project site as agricultural with an institutional overlay for the little league fields and a junior college that was once planned for the site (A1-1 / A1-1VL). The proposed development would change that designation to single family residential with an institutional overlay for the little league fields (RS-1 / A1-1VL).

The project also required a Zoning Administration change with a Yard Variance to address substandard lots and densities proposed in the development. Prior densities for the area only allowed 2.5 dwelling units per acre; whereas this development proposed 3.79 units per acre on the residential portion of the development.

Environmental Assessment for the project recommended a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project (MND 95-037). This MND was certified by the Environmental Review Committee and the Planning Commission. Significant environmental impacts were noted in the Initial Study, as indicated in the project chronology below.

Different from other cities, the Los Angeles Planning Commission does not have final purview over most planning and development decisions. In Los Angeles, these have been delegated to various review agencies within the Planning Department, such as the General Plan Advisory Board, the Environmental Review Committee, various Advisory Agencies--for rezones and development approval (e.g., Subdivision, Housing Development, and their Zoning Administrators), the Planning Commission--for appeals, and the City Council--for legal matters. For the untrained developer this may provide for a confusing and un-streamlined development process.

The site is located on land gently sloping to the south. Grading was required to prepare the street elevations and the building pads for the houses.

Through examination of the project chronology it appears that the General Plan amendment and zone change were required prior to the Tentative Tract Map approval. This linear approval process seems to have added substantial

California Department Housing and Community Development

time to the approvals process. Los Angeles' history of poor zoning practices through the mid-1980s and keeping zoning designations consistent with the General Plan have inspired a careful watch over legally rezoning properties prior to granting development approval.

The dedication of the Bernson / Hall Complex to the city was a sticking point in prior development proposals, as the developer thought that scale of land dedication was an excessive exaction. Prior approvals were disregarded by the developer due to this requirement for land dedication. This project proceeded due to an agreement reached that would dedicate the Bernson / Hall Complex to the city--which would negate the payment of any Quimby park fees. This land dedication was also the reason for much of the controversy surrounding the project, and the large degree of public participation and petition signing that ensued. The community simply did not want to lose their playing fields, upon which National Champion Little League teams have been produced.

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers were generally of a standard nature and very minimal. Several physical and cost additions were made to the project through agency comment, including: a sound wall separating the little league fields from the residential development and along the major adjacent streets, street improvements to Devonshire Street and Wilbur Drive, the production of a parking and driveway plan, solar heating and devices for homes and swimming pools, the use of fire resistant plants throughout the residential development, dedication of the little league fields to the city, and redesign of the residential development to provide conformance to street standards.

No change in the unit count was noted in the project file through the course of the approvals process.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

1987	Application submitted as part of 176 unit development to the north of the project site; project required the dedication of the little league fields site to the city; project was approved with the condition of a 10' sound wall between the residential lots and the baseball diamonds; project did not proceed as the developer did not want to dedicate the land to the city;
26 June 90	Parcel Map Subdivision Application submitted PM No. 6747;
18 Apr 91	Two lot subdivision approved by Advisory Agency subject to 10 conditions, including dedication of the little league fields to the city; Applicant opposed the dedication, suggesting that dedication of such a large parcel to the city was an improper exaction; the Applicant received a density bonus in exchange for the playing field dedication; Applicant appealed the action but was denied; project withdrawn;
27 Nov 95	Master Land Use Permit Application submitted;
27 Nov 95	Environmental Assessment form submitted by Applicant with Preliminary Solar Energy Report;
4 Dec 95	Soils Report and Foundation Evaluations submitted;
10 Dec 95	100 day time extension authorization granted for application review;
11 Dec 95	Request submitted for initiation of an amendment to the city's General Plan;
1 Feb 96	Initial Study Environmental Assessment form for traffic impacts prepared;
2 Feb 96	Engineer's letter to Planning Department – re: mailing to residents with fee of \$197;
13 Feb 96	Hydrology Report dated;
14 Feb 96	Engineer's letter to Planning Department – re: mailing to residents with fee of \$120;
15 Feb 96	Revised Master Land Use Permit Application submitted; with revised request submitted for initiation of an amendment to the city's General Plan and revised Environmental Assessment Form; filing fee form submitted with fee of \$11,518.08;
15 Feb 96	Consent to request for extension of time;
15 Feb 96	Subdivider's statement submitted;
15 Feb 96	Application for review of technical reports with fee of \$116;
27 Feb 96	Department of Telecommunications comments – cable exists in the area already;

California Department Housing and Community Development

28 Feb 96	Environmental Review Committee meeting: issued Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 95-6357 for zone change, subdivision and General Plan amendment; several potentially significant impacts noted, including: grading, archaeological / cultural resources, tree loss, noise, increased water demand, illumination, landscaping, access drive issues, safety, increased solid waste; project qualifies for De Minimus Impact Finding and Certificate of Fee Exemption from California Department of Fish and Game;
29 Feb 96	Letter of Opposition from North Valley Home Owners Federation – re: traffic, noise, environmental pollution;
1 Mar 96	Neighborhood Planning Division comments – lots do not conform to the Northridge Community Plan;
5 Mar 96	Department of Transportation comments – parking and driveway plan required;
6 Mar 96	County Department of Health Services comments – none;
7 Mar 96	Zoning Engineer comments – standard;
26 Mar 96	Letter of Opposition from resident across street from site;
undated	Notice of Public Hearing for Advisory Agency meeting of 24 Apr 96;
19 Apr 96	Engineering Bureau comments – tract design unsatisfactory with regard to street standards and emergency access;
24 Apr 96	Advisory Agency meeting to review project;
4 May 96	Staff Report; recommended waiting until the General Plan amendment and zone change are processed before proceeding with subdivision and tract map permits; 7 pages of conditions, including: requirement for solar energy access report for houses and pools, solar devices to warm swimming pools, fire resistant plants, fire sprinklers per Fire Department review of plans, a Home Owners Association, replace all trees or provide trees at 1 per 3 units, dedicated ball fields to city; minimal findings included in staff report; expanded findings for the subdivision approval with project specific explanations;
9 June 96	Department of Transportation comments – none;
10 June 96	Project routed to agencies for comments – re: zone change;
10 June 96	Engineer's drawings submitted;
10 June 96	Subdivision fees of \$432.34 paid;
undated	Request for revised tract map;
undated	Engineering Bureau comments – requirement for street improvements to Devonshire Street and Wilbur Drive;
19 June 96	General Plan Advisory Board approved zone changes and amendment to the General Plan;
undated	Two petitions with + 700 signatures received by the Planning Department in opposition to the project;
undated	Letter of Opposition with 25 signatures received by the Planning Department;
undated	55 Letters of Opposition to the project received by the Planning Department;
1 Aug 96	Staff Report for Planning Commission meeting – re: amendment to Northridge Community Plan for zone change;
1 Aug 96	Planning Commission meeting; approval of rezone with 14 conditions of approval;
15 Oct 96	Building and Safety comments – none;
22 Oct 96	Applicant letter to Planning Department – re: Little League Field dedication to city;
25 Nov 96	Advisory Agency meeting and public hearing: approval of tract 52135;
25 Nov 96	Affidavit of mailing to residents signed;
11 Dec 96	Appeal period for public comments closes;
15 Feb 97	Project routed to agencies for comments;
22 Feb 97	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of incomplete application;
23 Feb 97	Engineering Bureau letter to Applicant – re: processing fee of \$5605 requested;
27 Feb 97	Information sheet for vesting of the tract map;
11 Mar 97	Applicant letter to Planning Department – re: zone change notification;
undated	Notice of Determination: mitigated Negative Declaration prepared;
28 Mar 97	Letter of Correction – re: street standards;
9 Apr 97	Petition of support for project with close to 3000 signatures submitted;

California Department Housing and Community Development

21 Apr 97	Applicant letter to Planning Department – re: no phasing anticipated; project to be developed all at one time;
24 Apr 97	Condition Compliance Notice from Applicant – re: condition 19;
1 May 97	Solar Report dated;
13 May 97	Master Covenant and Agreement for vesting tract map filed with city;
16 May 97	Condition Compliance Notice from Applicant – re: condition 15 a-k, 17;
22 May 97	Letter of Correction – re: Quimby fee clarification;
5 June 97	Master Covenant and Agreement for vesting tract map filed with city;
5 June 97	Zone variance for increased height of CMU wall granted;
5 June 97	Condition Compliance Notice from Applicant – re: condition 25;
14 July 97	Building Permit application submitted for Grading;
26 June 97	Condition Compliance Notice from Applicant – re: condition 11, 22a;
2 July 97	Condition Compliance Notice from Applicant – re: condition 18;
29 July 97	Condition Compliance Notice from Applicant – re: condition 16;
20 Aug 97	Grading Permit issued;
7 Oct 97	City Council / Building and Safety approval of final map;
10 Oct 97	Permit sign-off work sheet;
15 Oct 97	Building and Safety comments – standard;
17 Apr 98	Building Permit issued;
6 May 98	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: deletion of condition 15c;

Total Time for Approvals:

Rezone Approval by City:	27 Nov 1995 - 1 Aug 1996 = 7 months
Project / Tract Approval by City:	1 Aug 1996 - 25 Nov 1996 = 4 months
Building Permit Approval:	14 July 1997 - 17 Apr 1998 = 9 months
Building Construction Period:	currently in construction

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received huge amounts of both support and opposition from neighbors and other groups. Both camps undertook petition signing campaigns. The pro-project forces collected approximately 3000 signatures while the anti-project forces collected about 700 signatures. The opposition to the project also included over 50 letters with many signatures. Several groups also had problems with the project, namely the North Valley Home Owners Federation, who were concerned about traffic, noise, and other environmental impacts. The Northridge Neighborhood Planning Division also had qualms about the project with respect to conformance with the Northridge Community Plan. Because of this non-conformance with lot standards, a yard variance was sought through a General Plan amendment.

ORANGE COUNTY:
Las Flores: single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name:</i>	Springfield at Las Flores
<i>Project Location:</i>	25726 Grassy Knoll Lane Northwest of Oso Parkway and Meandering Trail East of Mission Viejo in the Las Flores Community of Rancho Santa Margarita
<i>Developer:</i>	John Laing Homes California, Inc 19600 Fairchild, Ste 150, Irvine California 92715 714 476 9090
<i>Owner:</i>	Same
<i>Project Components:</i>	-76 residential lots on 13.66 acres = 5.56 units per acre -4 lettered landscaped lots at perimeter -lot sizes range from 4200 sf to 7775 sf. -three house plans each with three elevation options -plan 1: 3 bdrm, 2.5 ba, 2 story, 2 car garage @ 2006 sf ea -plan 2: 4 bdrm, 2.5 ba, 2 story, 3 car garage @ 2280 sf ea -plan 3: 4 bdrm, 2.75 ba, 2 story, 3 car garage @ 2453 sf ea -20 units have detached garages with guest quarters above -streetside parking throughout the development -no community amenities or recreation centers on site
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APNs: 780-091-04, -05, -06, -07 Tentative Tract Map: TT 15459 Environmental Permit: EP 69804 Planning Application: PA 97-0041 (Site Development Permit)
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Wagner Pacific Inc. Architecture: jbz Dorius Architecture and Planning Landscape Architecture: Professional Design Associates

Project Description:

This housing subdivision is located on Oso Parkway to the east of Mission Viejo. The project site is an irregularly shaped parcel bordered on the north and east by existing and future single family subdivisions, to the west by the Las Flores Middle School and to the south by Oso Parkway and vacant land. The Las Flores Community is the southernmost development of Rancho Santa Margarita. The bulk of the Santa Margarita development areas are located to the north of this project site. The O'Neill Regional Park surrounds Rancho Santa Margarita and the Las Flores Community and provides open space that is within short walking distance to the project site.

The site is composed of a single loop road that accesses all of the lots. A single vehicular access point at Grassy Knoll Lane is located at the northeast corner of the subdivision from Meandering Trail. The lots are mid-sized and provide adequate front and back yards. Flag lots are located at the corners of the subdivision. The corner lots are considerably larger than those to the interior. The interior lots have considerably smaller back and front yards. A sound wall fences the lots to the south and east of the project. A 16' landscape easement has been provided along Oso Parkway to continue the viewscape corridor required by the county; and a smaller landscape buffer has

California Department Housing and Community Development

been provided to the east of the subdivision—to separate it from two rows of houses located between this project and Meandering Trail.

There is no architectural theme to the development. The facade options include contemporary Mediterranean, Craftsman, and American Suburban styles. Each of the three models has 3 elevation options respective of these styles. The front elevations are dominated by garages on all of the options. The front facades are lightly detailed, and the other 3 sides of each unit are relatively unadorned. The front elevations are finished with stucco plaster on the walls, shingle, brick and wood siding details on the front, flat concrete tiles for the roof, minimal door and window trim, and sash and sliding windows. The hip and gable roofed buildings have few pop out elements on the front elevations to create visual interest and curb appeal. All of the units have some type of a minimized porch. 20 of the units have detached over-garage guest houses at the rear of their lots.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project site falls under the jurisdiction of the Las Flores Community Plan. No zone change was required for the project site, as it had been pre-zoned through the community plan (suburban residential MDR 3.5 - 6.5 units per acre). At the time of application the site had been rough graded and was vacant.

Environmental Assessment for the project was tiered off the Las Flores Community Plan EIR that had been certified in 1990. Few environmental issues were raised in the Initial Study. The project site is located in an area prone to wild-fires and required that a fuel modification plan be set in place to control vegetation growth at the perimeter. Oso Parkway to the south of the project site had been designated as a landscape / viewscape corridor by the Master Plan of Scenic Highways, and thus required special landscape treatments and the provision of a deep setback. Parkland dedication was covered under previous arrangements agreed between the developer and the county with regard to the overall community plan.

The developer requested various exceptions to county development standards, including: various rear yard setback variances, driveway width reductions, deviation from non-standard street knuckles and corners, and deviation from center-line radii less than the required 250' radius.

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers and agencies were generally of a standard nature, and tended to require few additional project requirements, outside of fees. Additional project site reporting was mandated on a variety of environmental topics. Various impact and assessment district fees were required by a variety of agencies. And a few physical additions were made to the project through agency comment, including the addition of a sound wall around the project, fuel modification, fire sprinklers in the units, and the creation of a Home Owners' Association. Fees and assessment district impacts were wide ranging, and included: Capistrano Unified School District fees, Sheriff Substation Facility Fees, Santa Margarita Water District fees, the Foothill Circulation Phasing Program and Foothill / Eastern Transportation Corridor Thoroughfare and Bridge fees, an Off-Site Fee program (\$155,000), a roads fee program, and an additional encroachment permit with requisite fees.

No change in the unit count was noted in the project file through the course of the entitlements process.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

29 Jan 90	Screen check EIR submitted for the Las Flores Community Plan;
7 May 90	Draft EIR accepted by County; significant impacts include: native plant loss; natural resource and habitat losses; increased services, traffic, noise, pollution, etc;
9 July 90	Draft responses to comments prepared;
30 July 90	Revisions to EIR prepared based on responses and comments;

California Department Housing and Community Development

5 Sept 90	Revisions to EIR prepared based on responses and comments;
1 Oct 90	Revisions to EIR prepared based on responses and comments;
5 Dec 90	FEIR No. 506 certified by County;
28 Feb 97	Title Report by First American Title Insurance Co;
3 Mar 97	Site plan dated by Engineer;
13 Mar 97	Engineer letter to Planning Department -- re: request for approval of application, tentative tract and site plan / model site plan;
13 Mar 97	Applications submitted for project: with deposit of \$6000 for land use, environmental analysis and subdivision approvals;
13 Mar 97	Site plan submitted by Engineer;
13 Mar 97	Project routed to agencies for screen check;
18 Mar 97	Engineer's Fax to Planning Department -- re: changes to site plan submittal;
18 Mar 97	Indoor and Outdoor Noise Analysis by Mestre Greve Associates;
18 Mar 97	Project routed to agencies for comment; due back by 8 Apr 97;
24 Mar 97	Applicant letter to Planning Department -- re: intended use of guest houses as teenager space, study, or hobby room -- won't require extra parking spaces;
27 Mar 97	Streets Division comments: none;
31 Mar 97	County Property Permits comments: encroachment permit required for construction within right of way on Grassy Knoll Lane;
2 Apr 97	Grading Division comments: minor standard comments;
4 Apr 97	Initial Study by the Orange County Environmental Management Agency: project tiered off previous EIR; no significant impacts noted for this project; potential impacts listed along with recommended mitigations; mitigations include: additional geotechnical and drainage studies, grading and excavation to be halted during high wind periods, all lots to be landscaped and irrigated;
9 Apr 97	Acoustical Analysis Report Submittal Form approved: conditions include a freestanding sound wall, mechanical ventilation within houses to avoid sound from open windows;
9 Apr 97	Parks, Hiking, Biking comments: landscape conditions provided;
9 Apr 97	Acoustics / Building Division comments: none;
11 Apr 97	Grading Permit application submitted;
14 Apr 97	Fire Safety comments: none;
15 Apr 97	Drainage Division comments: none;
15 Apr 97	Construction and Special Project comments: minor changes to fencing;
16 Apr 97	Traffic Engineering comments: conditions submitted along with Traffic and Bridge Fee requirements;
18 Apr 97	Exhibits submitted by applicant;
18 Apr 97	Project routed to agencies for comment; due back 7 May 97 in time for 28 May 97 Subdivision Committee meeting;
21 Apr 97	Memo to Environmental and Project Planning Services Division -- re: CEQA determination notification to Subdivision and Grading Services Division;
30 Apr 97	Grading Permit issued;
undated	Notice of Public Hearing for 22 May 97 Zoning Administrator Hearing;
22 May 97	Planning and Development Services Department Report: includes request for driveway modification to allow 9' rather than 10' driveways for 20 of the units, along with allowances for rear yard setback decreases; Staff Report recommends approval of 20 guest houses—which are only allowed to be occupied by the resident's family or guests—and not to be rented; various other standard conditions of approval included;
22 May 97	Supplement to Planning and Development Services Department Report: reciprocal access agreement for several lots required, along with rear yard setback adjustments to one of the lots;

California Department Housing and Community Development

22 May 97	Zoning Administrator Hearing: project approved by the Zoning Administrator; includes extensive findings and conditions of approval; request to phase development is also approved; conditions include the following requirements: notification to residents of sound impacts from a nearby Marine Corps Air Station, fees required for construction of a Sheriff's station, additional soil and drainage studies, water improvement plans, fuel modification in the landscape lots around the subdivision, fire sprinklers in all houses, the creation of a Home Owners Association, slope maintenance by the Home Owners Association, and other fees outlined; No public opposition to the project is voiced;
28 May 97	Final Tentative Tract Map Report: contains 20 findings relating to general plan, environmental and CEQA consistency; project not exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees;
28 May 97	Orange County Subdivision Committee approves Tentative Tract Map with findings and conditions:
4 June 97	NPDES Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Wagner Pacific;
26 June 97	NPDES Water Quality Management Plan for tract reviewed;
28 July 97	Memo from Consistency Management Section stating that the tract map has been reviewed and been found consistent with other plan documents and ordinance regulations;
31 July 97	Consistency Management Section comments;
29 Aug 97	Applicant letter to Environmental Management Agency – re: request for revision to previous site plan approval;
2 Sept 97	Application CP 97-0090 filed to revise the open space areas and the lettered lot configurations; fees of \$190 paid;
16 Sept 97	Memo to file – re: changes to previous approval as outlined in the application request above;
23 Feb 98	Applicant letter to Planning Department – re: request for revision to previous site plan approval;
24 Feb 98	Application CP 98-0017 filed to revise a few of the lots and house plans, along with relocation of some of the guest house units; fees of \$190 paid;
24 Feb 98	Building Permit application submitted for models;
25 Feb 98	Memo to file – re: changes to previous approval as outlined in the application request above;
31 Mar 98	Building Permits issued for models;
Aug 98	Project in construction.

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	13 Mar 1997 - 28 May 1997 = 2.5 months
Building Permit Approval for models:	24 Feb 1998 - 31 Mar 1998 = 1.25 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

No opposition to the project was noted in the project files.

CITY of REDDING:
Silver Creek: single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name</i>	Silver Creek
<i>Project Location:</i>	4250 & 4600 Goodwater Avenue in the Enterprise area of southeast Redding
<i>Developer:</i>	Redding Properties, LP / Redding Properties II 3404 Bechelli Lane Ste. E, Redding California 96002 530 223 3417
<i>Owner:</i>	Same
<i>Project Components:</i>	-216 total units on 95.84 acres = 2.25 units per acre -lot sizes range from 12,000 sf to 22,603 sf -10 construction phases -phases are to be optioned to different home builders -no housing unit information included within the application
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APN: 54-08-22, 54-09-33 Subdivision: S-5-97 Rezone: RZ 9-97
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Duane K. Miller, Professional Engineer

Project Description:

The project is located on relatively flat land in southeast Redding: to the west are single family residences, Shasta View Drive and Interstate 5; to the east are open space, agricultural, and single family residential uses and Goodwater Avenue; to the north is vacant land intended for future housing and highway 44; and to the south is vacant land and Rancho Road.

The site plan is composed of meandering loop roads and cul-de-sacs. It features two primary vehicular entrances from Shasta View Drive, each with landscaped median islands. A single access point is located at Goodwater Avenue (with no island median), and single stub streets have been located at the north and south boundaries to access adjacent properties. The streets within the project are off-set to disallow direct through traffic across the site. Landscaped roundabouts of 60' diameter are located at the major intersections within the development, with landscaped median islands at each street to direct one way traffic around the roundabout. The crosswalks and a 4' sidewalk encircling the roundabout are finished with textured paver bricks. Smaller landscaped roundabouts are located at each cul-de sac, and streetside planters are located within the curbside parking area throughout the development, and particularly at any "T" intersection. Two city wells are located along the eastern boundary to the site; and a 6.33 acre open space / park / wetlands / flood plain lot has been reserved within the development at the southeastern boundary of the site, extending inwards to the center.

This subdivision was approved in autumn 1997 and building permits have not yet been issued for any houses. No housing information was included in the Planning Department application, as the developer intends to option the project phases to various home builders.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project required a subdivision and rezoning approval from the Board of Administrative Review and the Planning Commission. The land was initially designated in an “unclassified district with a flood plain combining district.” The developer requested a change of zone to single family residential - R1 within a flood plain. The General Plan designates density for the site at 2 dwelling units / acre. At the time of application the land was vacant with only a few trees and two city wells located on the site.

The site is located in the Clover Creek Basin, which has experienced flash floods in the past. This flash flood and poor drainage potential was the primary reason for opposition to the project from residents of the area. The previous project approval for the site included an agreement with an adjacent subdivision to locate the detention basin for both properties at this current project site. The project is partially located in a FEMA flood plain, maintains two seasonal drainage paths across the site into this flood plain area, and supports .95 acres of jurisdictional wetlands. The wetlands permit from a previous project had expired, and a new one was required. Along these wetland areas, lot size could not be reduced below that allowed under the General Plan. The steeper portions of these drainage channels and the wetlands area have been designated open / park space within the development along the southeastern boundary of the parcel.

At the northeast corner and in a small piece of land along the eastern boundary are located city wells that must be fenced.

The city required oak trees of a certain size to be saved, and to make all attempts to save and replace all demolished oaks.

Key Project Adjustments:

Several agencies required additions to the project. The Public Works Department required road, curb, gutter, and sidewalk improvements along Shasta View Drive and Goodwater Avenue—the main access roads to the west and east of the project site respectively. Other requirements included: a meandering sidewalk along Shasta View Drive, landscaped median islands at the vehicular entrances along Shasta View Drive, a 7' sound wall along Shasta View Drive and 6' sound wall along Goodwater Avenue (block posts with wood fence inserts), meandering streets throughout the subdivision, turn pockets / knuckles at streets forming interior corners within the tract, full irrigation and drainage of publicly dedicated landscape areas, stub streets to adjacent properties, creation of a Home Owners Association to maintain landscape and open spaces. The city required a special assessment of \$821.73 per unit for drainage in the area, and a traffic signal assessment of \$187.84 per unit. No information in the project file indicated any school district settlement or mitigation agreement. Allowances were made to the developer in several instances: street width reductions were allowed to decrease drainage and runoff costs, sidewalks were waived on cul-de-sacs less than 300' in length.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

11 July 90	Board of Administrative Review meeting: approves previous project S-15-90 for Western Acres subdivision by Rob Middleton for 58 units; requires estimated \$83,000 for drainage improvements; 17 conditions of approval included in approval;
16 July 90	Staff Report to Planning Commission – re: drainage and runoff to adjacent ponds and canals is problematic;
24 July 90	Planning Commission meeting: previous project approved; however the project is not carried forward for unknown reasons;
4 Mar 91	North State Resources letter to USACE – re: request for wetlands delineation;
6 Feb 92	Field inspection by USACE undertaken;
6 Mar 92	North State Resources finds .95 acres of wetlands on project site;

California Department Housing and Community Development

10 Apr 92	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) letter to North State Resources – re: waiver of evidence of water quality certification;
18 Apr 92	USACE wetlands delineation concurs with North State Resources findings on wetlands;
22 May 92	USACE letter to North State Resources – re: waiver of evidence of water quality certification received from RWQCB;
7 May 97	Title report by Placer Title Co;
23 May 97	Engineer's letter to Planning Department – re: correct density calculations;
28 May 97	Application submitted with fees of \$6739.20 to Planning Department;
23 June 97	Routing to agencies for comment;
30 June 97	Department of Transportation comments – standard;
1 July 97	Pacheco Union School District comments – statutory development impact fee not enough; school enrollment already impacted; request for additional mitigation agreement;
3 July 97	Electricity Department comments – standard;
3 July 97	Engineer's letter to Planning Department – re: request for hearing date and schedule;
3 July 97	Shasta Mosquito and Vector Control District comments—minimal;
5 July 97	California Native Plant Society letter to Planning Department – re: request for comprehensive botanical study of project site due to habitat potential for support of rare species;
7 July 97	Engineer's letter to Planning Department – re: previous wetlands delineation still in effect;
8 July 97	Police Department comments – staff to be impacted by new residences;
11 July 97	Planning Department letter to Engineer – re: hearing schedule for project and development process calendar;
16 July 97	RWQCB comments – requirement for construction activity storm water permit;
15 July 97	PG&E comments – services already exist to project site;
25 July 97	Traffic Engineer's comments—standard;
31 July 97	Initial Study completed: unmitigated Negative Declaration recommended;
4 Aug 97	Mailing list request form submitted -- to notify residents of project;
6 Aug 97	Public Notice of Negative Declaration published for comment at Board of Administrative Review of 26 Aug 97;
26 Aug 97	Board of Administrative Review meeting; project continued to meeting on 11 Sept 97;
9 Sept 97	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 23 Sept 97;
9 Sept 97	Public Works comments – waiver for sidewalks allowed;
11 Sept 97	Board of Administrative Review meeting; staff requests continuation to next meeting because of new drawings which are to be submitted and changes to the project; residents of Clover Creek Basin opposed to project and any further development of the area due to flash flood problems caused by runoff—generally opposed to urbanization;
11 Sept 97	Mailing list request form submitted – expanded subdivision notification to residents;
12 Sept 97	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 23 Sept 97;
14 Sept 97	Land Development Engineer's comments – minor;
17 Sept 97	Board of Administrative Review meeting; project approved by unanimous vote; conditions and concerns of Planning Department and Clover Creek Basin residents discussed; conditions of approval reviewed and expanded to include requirement for at least 20% of the garages to be side entry garages facing away from the street to be scattered through the development; stub streets for future subdivisions on adjacent lots are also required; 43 conditions included;
18 Sept 97	Staff Report to Planning Commission: recommendation from staff for project approval;
19 Sept 97	Engineer's drawings revised;
23 Sept 97	Planning Commission meeting: Negative Declaration and project approved by unanimous vote; discussion of hydrology and drainage concerns brought up at the Board of Administrative Review; conditions of approval remain largely intact—except rewording of condition for side entry garages, developer to monitor this condition throughout the life of the development regardless of who builds the homes; 43 conditions of approval and 29 standard subdivision conditions agreed;
23 Sept 97	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: rewording of side entry garage condition and notification of Planning Commission approval;

California Department Housing and Community Development

26 Sept 97	Notice of Determination for Negative Declaration published;
30 Sept 97	De Minimus Impact Finding and Certificate of Fee Exemption from California Department of Fish & Game;
9 Oct 97	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: clearance of trees, oaks to remain;
31 Oct 97	Engineer's letter to Planning Department – re: previously approved project's development agreement had approved the location of a detention pond from another adjacent development to the current project site unbeknownst to the current developer;
4 Nov 97	Engineer's letter to Planning Department – re: follow-up on detention pond issues;
6 Apr 98	City Internal memo – re: issues related to first phase road improvement construction;
current	As of August 1998 the project was in the street improvement construction phase—no building permits have been granted for houses thus far;

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City: 28 May 1997 - 23 Sept 1997 = 3.75 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

Public opposition to the project was registered by residents of the Clover Creek area who have had previous problems with flash flooding due to poor drainage and excessive runoff from newly constructed projects.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY:
Del Webb: single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name:</i>	Del Webb
<i>Project Location:</i>	West of Adams and North of 40 th Avenue and I-10
<i>Developer:</i>	Del Webb California Corporation 39755 Washington Street, Bermuda Dunes California 92201 -or- 39755 Berkey Drive, Bermuda Dunes California 92203 760 360 3600
<i>Owner:</i>	Same
<i>Project Components:</i>	-461 total units on 92.8 acres = 4.96 units per acre -project in 3 subdivision phases with many more construction phases within each subdivision -phase I: 163 lots range from 5000 sf to 17,390 sf -phase II: 185 lots range from 5490 sf to 9500 sf -phase III: 113 lots range from 5900 sf to 18,000 sf -no housing information was included in the project file -the phases are to be optioned to various home builders
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APNs: 605-080-003, -004, -005 605-030-003, -004 065-020-001 605-050-013-010, -011, -013 605-040-003, -004 605-060-009, -010, -014, -037, -038, -039 Tentative Tract 27365 Environmental Assessment 36153 / 36049 III B 9
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineer: Pomas and Associates

Project Description:

This subdivision is located in the desert north of Indio and Bermuda Dunes. The project site is surrounded on all sides by a golf course. To the southeast is the Bermuda Dunes Airport; to the south is Interstate 10; to the east is Adams Street. Primary vehicular access to the site is from the east at Adams Street.

The site plan is composed of a main loop road that accesses all of the phases with smaller loop roads and cul-de-sacs throughout. The lots vary in size across the phases, and little discernible physical difference between the phases is noted. The project is to be targeted to senior citizens as an upscale retirement community.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project is located in the Del Webb special planning area and required a rezone from vacant land to a single family residential land use designation. The land was vacant desert land prior to project approval. The project site is generally located in the West Chuckawalla Zoning District in the Bermuda Dunes area, and within the sphere of influence of the city of Indio.

The project site was generally flat and required little grading.

Various desert specific mitigations were required as a result of an earlier EIR 367 completed for the larger Del Webb community, including: archaeological, paleontological, biological, fringe-toed lizard, blow-sand, and other drainage / run-off mitigations. The project is within the 100 year flood plain, and the site is subject to infrequent flooding up to 2'.

Key Project Adjustments:

Few additions were made to the project as a result of agency comments; however several mitigation fees and assessments were required for project approval, including: fire @ \$400 / lot; traffic signal @ \$150 / lot; traffic @ \$83 / trip; and fees for the Desert Sands School District, Road and Bridge Benefit District, Libraries, Development Impacts, Parks, and Public Facilities. Total planning fees paid = \$63,707.30.

Per developer request the lot count was reduced by 14 to 481 lots from 495.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

5 Dec 91	Planning Application submitted;
5 Dec 91	Engineer's drawings dated;
2 Jan 92	Building and Safety Department comments – standard;
2 Jan 92	Planning Department comments – project to received fast track status;
2 Jan 92	Project routed to agencies for comments; comments due back 15 Jan 92;
7 Jan 92	Amendment No. 1 to Tentative Tract Map; reconfiguration of some lots;
9 Jan 92	Riverside County Sheriff comments – standard;
16 Jan 92	So Cal Gas Co comments – facilities exist in area;
17 Jan 92	Riverside County Fire Department comments – standard fire safety comments + fire protection fee of \$400 / lot;
20 Jan 92	Coachella Valley Water District comments – flood control issues and mitigations;
23 Jan 92	Riverside County Department of Transportation (desert office) comments – 19 conditions included, as well as a listing of required fees--\$150/lot for traffic signal impacts, \$83/trip, and assessment district fees;
28 Jan 92	Riverside County Department of Health comments – water and sewerage standards;
4 Feb 92	State Department of Transportation comments – request for new interchange improvement at I-10 and Washington Street; DOT will begin project study report in Mar 1992 to determine costs, configuration and construction schedule;
20 Feb 92	Staff Report and Conditions of Approval: 11 pages, 47 conditions; most are standard conditions—e.g., soils report, other agency conditions, development standards, Home Owners Association required, CC&Rs included, undergrounding of all utilities; however there are also various site specific conditions included as well, including: construction phasing must be in a west to east direction, landscape options must be offered to the buyers, a fringe-toed lizard habitat area mitigation plan is required, and a blow-sand mitigation plan is required;
20 Feb 92	East Area Planning Council meeting: approved project; adopted De Minimus Impact Finding and Certificate of Fee Exemption for project; approved Tentative Tract Map and amendment No. 1; adopted Negative Declaration for EA 36153;

California Department Housing and Community Development

16 Mar 92	Report of Approval to Board of Supervisors – re: East Area Planning Council approvals;
17 Mar 92	Board of Supervisors meeting: approves conditions for project;
29 Apr 92	Building and Safety Department land use check list filled out;
11 May 92	Amendment No. 2 to Tentative Tract Map; lot count is reduced from 495 to 481;
13 May 92	Minor changes to Tentative Tract Map;
4 June 92	Board of Supervisors meeting: project approved;
4 June 92	Tax Bond Certificate for \$52,500 filed;
16 July 92	Riverside County East Area Planning Council approves minor change to approved map;
7 Dec 92	Environmental Constraint sheet filed;
31 Aug 94	Revised Phasing Map submitted by developer with reduction of 14 lots per amendment No. 2; lots a bit larger: phase I = 163 lots to the north and east of the property; phase II = 185 lots to the south; phase III = 113 lots in the center;
27 Sept 94	Project routed to agencies for comments;
29 Sept 94	DOT (Desert Office) comments – none;
3 Oct 94	Fire Department comments – same as before;
25 Oct 94	Phasing Map approved by Planning Department Director;
24 Apr 96	Lots are given addresses;
unknown	Building Permit application submitted;
unknown	Building Permit issued;
unknown	Building permits finalized; construction and project complete.

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	5 Dec 1991 - 4 June 1992 = 6 months
Building Permit Approval:	unknown
Building Construction Period:	unknown

Public Participation / Opposition:

No public opposition from neighbors and other groups was noted on the project.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE:
Silverado Oaks: single-family subdivision

Project Name:	Silverado Oaks 7
Project Location:	1550 Junction Boulevard in Silveroaks Planned Community northwest corner of Base Line Road and Woodcreek Oaks Blvd. southwest corner of city, north of Interstate 80 Silverado Creek models at 1540 Ledbury St. Silverado Verandah models at 1033 Rudgewick Dr. Silverado Half-Plex models at 1025 Rudgewick Dr/1650 Luton Dr.
Developer:	Elliott Homes / H.C. Elliott Inc. 160 Blue Ravine Road, Ste. A, Folsom California 95630 916 984 1300 Unit 7B Silverado Creek Office: 916 771 9240 Unit 7C and 7F Silverado Verandah Office: 916 771 2271
Owner:	Same
Project Components:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-620 units proposed on 154.1 acres =4.02 units / acre-8.7 acre park site, 30.8 acre wetland preserve-seven development units (phases) with a variety of lot & housing types-Unit 7A: 122 large single family lots optioned to another developerUnit 7B Silverado Creek: 79 lots: 55 lg. single family + 24 half-plex-Unit 7C Silverado Verandah: 112 lots: 86 single family + 26 half-plex-Unit 7D Silverado Verandah: 39 lots: 31 single family + 8 half-plex-Unit 7E: 129 cluster housing lots-Unit 7F Silverado Verandah: 56 lots: 26 single family + 30 half-plex-Unit 7G Silverado Verandah: 83 lots: 59 single family + 24 half-plex -five lot & housing types:-177 large single family residential lots @ 4.2 units / acre min. lot area 6300 sf with allowable unit sizes 1400 sf - 2600 sf-202 small single family residential lots @ 6.1 units / acre min. lot area 4275 sf with allowable unit sizes 1000 sf - 2000 sf-88 small half-plex lots @ 6.1 units / acre min. lot area 3675 sf with no limit on unit sizes-24 large half-plex lots @ 4.3 units / acre min. lot area 4200 sf with no limit on unit sizes-129 cluster housing lots @ 10 units / acre no min. lot area or unit specifications included -Silverado half-plex units:-Plan 1: 2 bdrm / 2 ba, 1 car garage, 1 story @ 980 sf-Plan 2: 2 bdrm / 2 ba, 1 car garage, 1 story @ 1060 sf

California Department Housing and Community Development

-Silverado Creek Series: large lot housing units

- Plan 1: 3 bdrm / 2 ba, 3 car garage, 1 story @ 1691 sf
- Plan 2: 4 bdrm / 2 ba, 3 car garage, 1 story @ 1964 sf
- Plan 3: 4 bdrm / 2 ba, 3 car garage, 1 story @ 2000 sf
- Plan 4: 4 bdrm / 2.5 ba, 3 car garage, tri-level @ 2173 sf
- Plan 5: 5 bdrm / 3 ba, 3 car garage, tri-level @ 2428 sf

-Silverado Verandah Series: small lot housing units

- Plan 1: 3 bdrm / 2 ba, 2 car garage, 1 story @ 1344 sf
- Plan 2: 3 bdrm / 2 ba, 2 car garage, 1 story @ 1468 sf
- Plan 3: 4 bdrm / 2 ba, 2 car garage, 1 story @ 1612 sf
- Plan 4: 2 bdrm / 2.5 ba, 2 car garage, 2 story @ 1956 sf

Project Numbers:

APNs: 017-390-016;
017-370-004, -009, -010, -013, -017, -370
General Plan Amendment: GPA 94-1
Specific Plan Amendment: SPA 94-2
Rezone: RZ 94-1
Subdivision Map: SUBD 94-1
Large Lot Subdivision Map: LLSUBD 94-7
Tree Permit: TP 94-3
Development Agreement: DA 94-04

Project Consultants:

Land Planner: The Spink Corporation
Civil Engineering: Morton & Pitalo, Inc.
Architecture:
Landscape Architecture: Craig Park Landscape Architecture

Project Description:

This mid-market planned development is located in the central-northwest section of Roseville in the Northwest Roseville Specific Planning Area. It is located in a high growth area of Roseville's western urban reserve, surrounded by other planned developments and Specific Plan Areas. The site is a long north-south irregular rectangle—the eastern boundary of which is jagged. Silverado Oaks 7 is but one phase of a larger Planned Community (with eight major planned developments in the area) by the same developer. To the south of the project site is Base Line Road and vacant county land; to the north is property owned by Kaufman and Broad as urban reserve land; to the west is the Del Webb planning area—with a variety of uses, and the North Roseville Phase II Specific Planning Area; to the east across Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard are various uses, including: an existing high school, other Elliott Homes wetlands reserves, the Silverado Oaks 8 and the Silverado Greens/Silverado Village planned developments—which include medium density residential tracts, business, professional, and commercial uses.

Within this planned development are located 7 sub-phases (parcel units numbered 7A - 7G). The units are situated with Unit 7A to the north and Unit 7G to the south. The site is bisected by Junction Boulevard, which runs east-west through the project site. To the north are Unit 7A and the large 30.8 acre wetlands reserve. Unit 7A has been assigned to a different home builder: JMC Construction, which intends to utilize its own house plans and marketing scheme. To the south are located the other parcel units and a smaller 8.7 acre municipal park, which is located at the center of these other parcel units.

There are five general lot sizes and housing types across the parcel units in Silverado Oaks 7: large single family lots, small single family lots, large half-plex lots, small half-plex lots, and cluster housing. There are 3 housing series across the parcel units. Silverado Creek is located at Unit 7B. This mid-market tract offers medium-sized houses on larger lots. Silverado Verandah is located at Units 7C, 7D, 7F, and 7G. The Silverado half-plexes are scattered throughout the previous sub-phases.

California Department Housing and Community Development

The houses in all three housing series are designed in a non-descript suburban style. Each of the models has 3 elevation options. The front elevations are dominated by garages on all of the options. The front facades are lightly detailed, and the other 3 sides of each house are Spartan. The front elevations are finished with stucco plaster, concrete roof tiles, minimal door and window trims, masonry veneers on the front, inoperable shutters, painted wood fascias, a few arches on some of the units, combination hip and gable roofs, and a few pop out elements on the front elevations to create visual interest and curb appeal.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project site falls under the jurisdiction of the Northwest Roseville Specific Plan. The project required both General Plan and Specific Plan amendments and a zone change to adjust land uses and densities from the existing urban reserve land use designation. The planned development was zoned primarily low- and medium-density residential use, however, within a Special Area Combining District. The project also required a development agreement between the city and the applicant, along with two subdivision map approvals and a tree permit.

To accommodate the proposed number of residential lots, units were transferred from other offsite and onsite parcels (including the wetlands and park parcels within this tract) to permit the 658 approved lots. The overall development required the consolidation of 7 separate parcels of land.

Fulfillment of affordable housing provision was achieved through an offsite affordable housing project associated with another Silverado Oaks development, the Heritage Apartments. None of the housing units in this planned development are affordable.

The developer was required to submit development guidelines as part of the conditions of approval and the Special Area Combining Zone that the project was designated through the rezone. These development guidelines detail all physical development standards, but have little mention of architectural design or site plan design. No house plans or elevations were submitted with the approval of this planned community. The guidelines allow the house plans and elevations to be reviewed by the Planning Director at a later date. These guidelines mandate 6' sound walls along Junction Boulevard and Base Line Road.

A US Army Corps of Engineers wetlands delineation was required prior to project approvals. USACE identified 30.8 acres of wetland areas that should be included in a wetlands preserve at the north of the site. Several seasonal vernal pools were located on this land. This wetlands reserve is located just north of another wetlands preserve on parcel 73A.

Environmental review was tiered off three other completed EIRs associated with other Silverado Oaks developments and the Northwest Roseville Specific Plan EIR which had already included Silverado Oaks 7-type development in the scope of future development. The project received a mitigated Negative Declaration and a Mitigation Monitoring Plan was established for the project. One mature tree on the site required fencing and preservation.

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers and agencies were of a standard nature. Few physical changes were made to the project in the process of collecting agency comments. Pedestrian access ways were required through the ends of cul-de-sacs to connect to through streets; a bike trail was required through the wetlands reserve, which was later reimbursed to the developer by the Parks and Recreation Department. The developer was required to fund construction of park and wetlands reserve improvements. Also, various impact and assessment district fees were collected by the city, including park fees despite provision of close to 40 acres of public open space.

California Department Housing and Community Development

No change in the unit count was noted in the project file through the course of the approvals process. However, it appears that fewer than the approved 658 residential lots are scheduled for construction. As the project has progressed, the developer has made adjustments to the site plans and it looks as if only 620 residential lots will be developed.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

21 Oct 88	EIR comments on Northwest Roseville Specific Plan;
22 Feb 89	City Council meetings begin to discuss Northwest Roseville Specific Plan; meetings continue weekly through March, April and May until specific plan is approved;
10 May 89	Northwest Roseville Specific Plan adopted and EIR certified by City Council Resolutions No. 89-83 and No. 89-93, respectively; plan has been amended 9 times up to 21 Oct 96; volumes of public comments are recorded on the plan;
15 June 90	Roseville Joint Union High School District impact fee agreement;
26 June 90	Land Use Design Guidelines for Northwest Roseville Specific Plan are prepared by Craig Park Associates, Landscape Architect;
Mar 92	US Army Corps of Engineers delineates wetlands at north edge of project site; several vernal pools located;
13 Aug 92	Regulatory Compliance for Pre-Discharge Notification for USACE, California Department of Fish and Game, US EPA, and the US Department of the Interior—Fish & Wildlife;
Nov 92	Geo-technical Engineering Study for project by Youngdahl & Assoc. Inc;
24 Dec 92	General Plan Amendment 92-14 approved; \$300 fee paid for Tentative Tract Map;
14 July 93	Wetland Mitigation and Monitoring Report for USACE by Sugnet & Associates;
15 Feb 94	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: processing costs and payments estimates outlined to Applicant, with request for payment of fee of \$8550;
16 Feb 94	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: required submittal items for application;
17 Feb 94	Application submitted for various permits and development approvals;
17 Feb 94	Development Application check list;
17 Mar 94	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: Design Guidelines and General Plan consistency questions;
20 Apr 94	Public Works comments: conditions of approval detailed;
28 Apr 94	Library comments: none;
28 Apr 94	Public Works comments;
29 Apr 94	Planning Department requests additional environmental information from the Applicant;
3 May 94	Public Works Engineering comments: costs and fees detailed;
4 May 94	Negative Declaration comments from Planning Department with fiscal impact analysis on city from project impacts;
4 May 94	Environmental meeting at Planning Department with Applicant;
12 May 94	Public Works comments;
27 May 94	Traffic Study comments;
27 May 94	Project routed to agencies for comment;
31 May 94	Sage Institute letter to Planning Department – re: project mitigation fees agreement with school district; 485 units transferred out of the Roseville City School District to the Dry Creek School District;
14 June 94	Public Works comments: extensive standard and site specific issues addressed;
15 June 94	Public Works comments on Traffic Study to Fehr and Peers;
16 June 94	Recreation and Parks Department comments;
20 June 94	Electricity Department comments: standard;
20 June 94	Initial Study for project completed by Planning Department: Negative Declaration recommended;
22 June 94	Fire Department comments: standard;
22 June 94	Environmental meeting at Planning Department with Applicant;

California Department Housing and Community Development

27 June 94 Planning Department comments: extensive comments on full spectrum of issues; 8 pages;
 27 June 94 Final Traffic Study by Fehr and Peers;
 28 June 94 Draft Conditions of Approval prepared by Planning Department;
 28 June 94 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: Preliminary Evaluation comments and conditions of approval issues;
 29 June 94 Public Works comments;
 30 June 94 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: Development Agreement comments;
 July 94 Water and Sewer Study by Morton & Pitalo;
 20 July 94 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: schedule for approvals and additional Development Agreement comments;
 23 Aug 94 Planning Department recommends Negative Declaration for project; no significant impacts noted; exempt from full EIR;
 23 Aug 94 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: further application requirements;
 24 Aug 94 Project routed to agencies for comment;
 25 Aug 94 Electricity Department comments: none;
 30 Aug 94 Project routed to agencies for comment;
 6 Sept 94 Silveroaks Unit 7 Development Guidelines revised;
 11 Sept 94 Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 22 Sept 94;
 14 Sept 94 Silveroaks Unit 7 Development Guidelines revised;
 21 Sept 94 Notice of Public Hearing for City Council meeting of 5 Oct 94;
 21 Sept 94 Letter of Opposition to project received by Planning Department – re: open space resources lost;
 22 Sept 94 Letter of Opposition to project received by Planning Department – re: urban reserve expansion and increased water use;
 22 Sept 94 Staff Report to Planning Commission: recommended approval of project, ratification of Negative Declaration; staff report includes only short minimal findings on the project;
22 Sept 94 Planning Commission meeting: GPA and SPA approved at this meeting; other issues discussed and continued to next meeting of 13 Oct 94;
 12 Oct 94 Silveroaks Unit 7 Development Guidelines revised;
 13 Oct 94 Letter of Opposition to project received by Planning Department – re: school impacts;
 13 Oct 94 Staff Report to Planning Commission: includes 48 conditions of approval, consolidated from agency comments;
13 Oct 94 Planning Commission meeting: project approved; Silveroaks Unit 7 Development Guidelines approved; Negative Declaration approved; Rezone, Large Lot Subdivision Map, Subdivision Map, Tree Permit, Development Agreement all approved; 7 pages and 48 conditions of approval agreed; requirements for 6' sound wall along Junction Blvd and Base Line Road;
 6 Dec 94 First Amendment to the Development Agreement;
 3 Feb 95 Planning Department memo to Engineer – re: comments on entire project;
 16 Feb 95 Planning Department Final Map comments;
 13 Mar 95 Planning Department memo to Engineer – re: comments on Unit 7F and improvement plans;
 17 Mar 95 Planning Department Final Map comments;
 19 Apr 95 Fees paid for all permits and approvals: \$12,807;
 25 Apr 95 Planning Department memo to Landscape Architect – re: landscape review comments;
 21 Oct 95 Subdivision Approval Form for Unit 7B;
 12 Jan 96 Planning Department comments on Unit 7B;
 Mar 96 Improvement Plans by Engineer dated and submitted;
 4 Apr 96 Planning Department comments on Units 7E and 7F;
 2 May 96 Tree and wetlands bonds signed;
 6 May 96 Tree Permit Inspection Check List;
 9 May 96 Planning Department subdivision approval form on Unit 7F;
 13 Aug 96 Supplemental environmental check list and initial study update by Planning Department;
 2 Oct 96 City Council meeting approves Unit 7A Tentative Subdivision Map and Developer Agreement;
 25 Nov 96 School District letter to Title Company – re: request for will serve letter for Unit 7A;
 9 Dec 96 City Clerk letter to Applicant – re: notification of City Council approval of Unit 7A;

California Department Housing and Community Development

13 Jan 97	Building Permit Application submitted for Silverado Verandah models;
15 Jan 97	Building Permit Issued for Silverado Verandah models; pre-master plan checked;
16 Jan 97	Planning Department comments to Applicant on Unit 7B; required retaining walls at significant cuts;
22 Jan 97	Development Agreement signed by all parties;
22 Jan 97	School District letter to Applicant – re: Unit 7F and its 79 units can be accommodated;
22 Jan 97	City Council meeting: approval of Unit 7F phase Final Map, Development Agreement, and Subdivision Map;
27 Jan 97	Notice of Completion for Unit 7A and 7F; 48 conditions met;
29 Jan 97	City Clerk letter to Applicant – re: notification of Final Map approval for phase 7F, Tentative Subdivision Map, and Development Agreement by City Council;
21 Feb 97	Engineer's responses to Planning Department comments on Unit 7B;
4 Mar 97	Planning Department comments to Applicant – re: Unit 7B;
2 Apr 97	City Council meeting: approval of Notices of Completion for Unit 7A;
2 June 97	Notice of Completion for 48 conditions for Unit 7F;
3 July 97	Building Permit Application submitted for Silverado Creek models;
9 July 97	City Council meeting: approval of Notices of Completion for Unit 7F;
21 July 97	Building Permit Issued for Silverado Creek models;
28 July 97	Engineering Division comments sent to project engineer;
15 Aug 97	Planning Department comments on Units 7C and 7D;
20 Aug 97	City Council meeting: approval of Unit 7B phase Final Map, Development Agreement, and Subdivision Map;
26 Aug 97	City Clerk letter to Applicant – re: notification of Final Map approval for phase 7B, Tentative Subdivision Map, and Development Agreement by City Council;
29 Aug 97	Final Map submitted for Unit 7C;
4 Sept 97	Engineering Division comments on Unit 7G;
10 Sept 97	Conditions met on Units 7C and 7D: rough grading;
24 Sept 97	Planning Department letter to Engineer – re: required submittals for Units 7C and 7D;
21 Oct 97	Request for Tentative Map extension from Applicant;
27 Oct 97	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: consideration of request for Tentative Map extension;
28 Oct 97	Project extension routed to agencies for comment;
29 Oct 97	Engineering Division comments on Units 7C and 7D;
6 Nov 97	Building Department comments on extension;
6 Nov 97	Public Works Engineering comments on extension;
7 Nov 97	Electricity Department comments on extension;
26 Nov 97	Building Permit Finaled for Silverado Creek models;
7 Dec 97	Notice of Public Hearing – for Subdivision Committee meeting of 17 Dec 97 – re: five year extension of Units 7C and 7G;
10 Dec 97	Formal request for 5 year extension on Units 7C and 7G from Applicant;
17 Dec 97	Staff Reports to the Subdivision Committee – re: Units 7C and 7G;
17 Dec 97	Subdivision Committee meeting: approval of Final Maps, Development Agreements, and 5 year extension for Units 7C and 7G;
22 Dec 97	City Clerk letter to Applicant – re: notification of Final Map approval for phase 7C, Tentative Subdivision Map, and Development Agreement by City Council;
19 Jan 98	Notice of Completion for 27 conditions for Unit 7B;
18 Feb 98	City Council meeting: approved Certificate of Completion for Unit 7B;
13 May 98	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: request to release wetland and tree preservation bonds for Unit 7A;

California Department Housing and Community Development

Total Time for Approvals:

Preliminary Studies & Reports: 1992 - early 1994
Project Approval by City: 17 Feb 1994 - 13 Oct 1994 = 8 months

Building Permit Approval for models:
Silverado Verandah—pre-mastered: 13 Jan 1997 - 15 Jan 1997 = 2 days
Silverado Creek—standard approval: 3 July 1997 - 21 July 1997 = .75 months

Building Construction Period for models:
Silverado Verandah models: 15 Jan 1997 - not finalized yet (to Aug 98) = 19.5 months
Silverado Creek models: 21 July 1997 - 26 Nov 1997 = 4.25 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received minor opposition from neighbors. Three letters of opposition from neighbors are noted in the city's planning files. Opposition to the project in these letters was based on creeping urbanization, school, water, and land resource impacts.

Simmering opposition to urbanization in this section of Roseville seems to have spilled over from the earlier Northwest Roseville Specific Plan adoption period. Several hundred pages of opposition to development in this area is documented during the periods of the specific plan and EIR public hearings. Mitigation, monitoring and evaluation programs were established to assuage most of the concerns from this earlier opposition. Yet, neighborhood concerns are still visible in the minor opposition to this current project.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY:
Laguna Mirage: single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name:</i>	Laguna Mirage
<i>Project Location:</i>	Northeast corner of Old Creek Drive and Laguna Boulevard Laguna Creek - Elk Grove area of south Sacramento County between highways 5 and 99 and to the east of Laguna West models at 6484, 6486 and 6488 Laguna Mirage Lane
<i>Developer:</i>	The Schaber Company 7700 College Town Drive, Ste. 214, Sacramento California 916 387 8004 Lexington Homes 3480 Sunrise Boulevard, No. 200, Rancho Cordova California 95742 916 631 4200
<i>Owner:</i>	Laguna Mirage Associates 3001 "I" Street, Sacramento California 95816
<i>Project Components:</i>	-153 lots on 15.91 acres = 9.62 units / acre -two phases -five floor plans with various elevations -Plan 1: 2 bdrm / 2 ba @ 923 sf -Plan 2: 3 bdrm / 2 ba @ 1117 sf -Plan 3: 3 bdrm / 2.5 ba @ 1228 sf -Plan 4: 3 bdrm / 3 ba @ 1288 sf -Plan 5: 3 bdrm / 2.5 ba @ 1374 sf -all with 2 car garages -expected sales prices of \$105K - \$122K per unit -one recreation lot with a community clubhouse
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APNs: 119-0153-05, -06 Subdivision Development Planning Permit: 95SDP-SPP-XXP-0450 Tentative Subdivision Map: TSM 95-0450
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Cooper, Thorne & Assoc. Inc. Architecture: jbz Dorius

Project Description:

This moderate income, small lot, single family project is located in a rapidly urbanizing area of south Sacramento County in the Laguna Creek area. To the west of the project site are Old Creek Drive, Laguna Place Way, and single family subdivisions; to the east is another single family subdivision; to the north is yet another single family subdivision; to the northwest is Feather Creek Drive, which borders the project site at the corner; and to the south is a single family subdivision across Laguna Boulevard.

The project is a private gated community, with private streets, and two vehicular entrances located at Old Creek Drive and Feather Creek Drive, both on the west side of the parcel. These entrance roads lead directly to a single loop road that dominates the site plan. From this loop road, regularly spaced shared driveways and hammer-head

California Department Housing and Community Development

cul-de-sacs (at the corners of the development) access the bulk of the lots. No curbside parking is allowed to the sides of these access driveways and cul-de-sacs, at the exterior of the loop road or within 30' of a curved radius at the corners of the loop road. Public parking is only allowed at the inside edge of the loop road and in visitor parking bays at the corners of the project site. The recreation lot and community clubhouse are located near the main vehicular entrance from Old Creek Drive. This entrance point is divided with a landscaped median strip and gates separating in-bound and out-bound traffic. Smaller community open space lots have been located at the corners of the development adjacent to visitor parking bays.

The lots are typically small throughout the subdivision, with little backyard or front yard space. They are clustered together between the access driveways and cul-de sacs. The setbacks and lot shapes for each lot are irregular to accommodate this clustering. Many of the lots have zero lot lines, with no windows allowed on that side of the house. In the original planning application, the developer intended 4 or 6 lots to come together to share backyard space, in what the developer called 4-packs and 6-packs. This shared yard configuration was consistent throughout the development, except at the corners and some edges of the site. However, this shared yard scheme was dropped and the lots now have tiny fenced backyards. The lots average approximately 2500 sf ea.

The streets in the subdivision are purposefully narrow to create the feel of a tighter community and save on construction costs. In addition the lots have minimal driveways, at 5' deep each, to economize on space and raise the density of the project to over 9 units per acre. Since the street widths and driveways have been minimized, the county has required that residents park their vehicles in their garages. In addition, each garage is to be fitted with a roll up garage door and an automatic garage door opener to ease maneuvering from the public right-of-way.

The buildings are designed in an austere suburban style with horizontal hardboard siding finishes, asphalt composition shingle roofing, aluminum windows, roll-up garage doors, and narrow wood window and door trim. The buildings have few details. The buildings have combination gable and hipped roofs with few pop-outs, save for the two car garage, which dominates the front elevations of every unit. Only the front elevation is detailed, with the other three sides of the building left unadorned.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project site falls under the jurisdiction of the 1978 Laguna Community Plan and the local Advisory Council.

The project was initially part of the Laguna Park Village that was processed in 1982, and later amended in 1985 (an addition of 16 units), 1987 (an upzoning to increase density), and 1991 (a redesign of the project to allow 200 attached townhouses). The previous developer never proceeded with the project in prior years due to adverse market conditions.

The current developer was required to apply for a Special Development Permit, to allow for deviations from the required lot area, lot depth, and setback requirements—and to allow for a gated community with private streets and driveways.

Since the project is at the outskirts of the county, the project site is served by only one bus line. Insufficient transportation options for the target population was a concern of planners and transportation officials, as well as the local Advisory Council who opposed the project for this community—suggesting it was mismatched to local conditions.

The project is located in the FEMA 100 year flood plain.

The project received a Mitigated negative declaration from the County's Department of Environmental Review and Assessment.

A single oak tree on the site was required to be preserved.

California Department Housing and Community Development

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers and agencies were of a standard nature. Just a few physical changes were made to the project in the process of collecting agency comments. These changes consisted of several new requirements, including: a sound wall at the south and west property lines, visitor parking areas, a bike path and pedestrian accessway through the project, parking only on the inside of the loop road, vertical curbing, no RV parking, automatic garage door openers, and roll-up garage doors. The Planning Department required a minimum 5' front setback to allow the required utility easement—the developer had only proposed a 3' setback.

Although the developers had been touting the project as an affordable housing project, targeted at single women and mothers, no statutory affordability criteria was applied to the project—until required by the county. Late in the project a 15% affordability set aside was imposed on the development.

Fees for the project seem to have been of a standard nature. The applicant and school district entered into an independent project impact mitigation agreement, in addition to a square footage fee. Other fees and assessments included participation in a Lighting and Landscape Assessment District and various community facility districts, and payment of \$6000 per acre for drainage fees. The county also required the formation of a Home Owners Association for the project to maintain the private streets and public landscaping within the project boundaries.

No change in the unit count was noted in the project file through the course of the approvals process.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

28 July 95	Planning Department memo – re: project review schedule;
1 Aug 95	Planning Application submitted; with Statement of Applicant Responsibility;
4 Aug 95	Planning fees paid to County: \$13,678 for various agencies: transit, parks, sheriff, water, roads, SIPs, environment, Planning Commission, air quality, health, hazardous materials, and Department of Environmental Review & Assessments (DERA);
4 Aug 95	884 Action Form and check list;
4 Aug 95	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: schedule of Subdivision Review Committee (SRC) hearing on 27 Oct 95;
4 Aug 95	Notice of Public Hearing;
7 Aug 95	Project routed to agencies for comment;
10 Aug 95	Planning Department letter to agencies seeking comment on project;
11 Aug 95	Planning Department and Land use comments;
15 Aug 95	Sacramento Regional Transit Authority comments: a bike path and pedestrian access through the project is required despite the private-gated nature of the project;
21 Aug 95	PG&E comments: none;
21 Aug 95	Transportation Division comments: request for landscape corridors at project streets;
24 Aug 95	Fire Department - Elk Grove Community Services District comments: project will impact emergency services; does not meet road width standards; requirement that parking only be allowed on inside of loop road;
25 Aug 95	Water Resources Division memo – re: developer to pay fair share for delineation of area wetlands by USACE;
28 Aug 95	Sheriff's comments: required several changes, including: vertical curbing, no RV parking, roll-up garage doors;
5 Sept 95	Elk Grove Unified School District comments: Project Review and Environmental Reply Form completed; Applicant requested to pay \$2.95 per sf + estimated impacts to school district;
7 Sept 95	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: agreement to expedite project due to it's purported affordable status; application deemed complete; hearings scheduled—Advisory Council on 14 Sept 95, SRC on 3 Nov 95, and Planning Commission on 27 Nov 95;

California Department Housing and Community Development

14 Sept 95	Building Department comments: approved reduced width of public utility easements to allow proposed building placement;
14 Sept 95	Franklin / Laguna Creek Planning Advisory Council (FLCPAC) meeting and public hearing; recommended denial of the project; they found the project not compatible with the area; the size of the subdivision is perceived as too small for a gated community; they had concerns for the safety of residents behind gates that limit access; the subdivision is not integrated well into the rest of the community – apartments would have been preferred over small lot affordable single family houses; however, rental units are likely to downgrade the neighborhood; the negative potential of the project outweighs any positive impacts to affordability; project denied 8-1; substantial public opposition spoke against the project;
28 Sept 95	Public Works comments: easements and sewer alignments detailed; 32% decrease in Mello-Roos special tax revenues for Laguna Creek LAFCO due to private streets;
28 Sept 95	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program recommended by DERA;
5 Oct 95	DERA comments: Negative Declaration recommended;
6 Oct 95	Sacramento Municipal Utility District comments: requirement of 12.5' utility easement at street and 5' easement at front property line;
23 Oct 95	Staff Report prepared: recommended full approval of project, except for a change to the driveway length at each lot—Planning Department recommends 5' setback and driveway to accommodate utility easements, rather than the 3' proposed by the Applicant; 4 pages and 30 conditions of approval included in report;
27 Oct 95	Park and Recreation comments: 6' sound wall required on both adjacent access streets—Old Creek Drive and Laguna Boulevard; requirement that park and open space lot be dedicated to Elk Grove Community Services District; requirement that project participate in the local Lighting and Landscape Assessment District;
2 Nov 95	Sacramento Municipal Utility District conditions of approval submitted top Planning Department for inclusion in full conditions list;
2 Nov 95	Initial Study prepared by DERA: Mitigated negative Declaration recommended; no significant impacts noted;
3 Nov 95	Water Resource Division comments: concern expressed for tight Right of Ways for access purposes;
3 Nov 95	SRC meeting: project approved; conditions of approval refined; within the minutes of the meeting is a comment that suggests that it is difficult to say no to a subdivision that is consistent with local zoning and General Plan requirements;
27 Nov 95	FLCPAC letter to Policy Planning Commission – re: negative recommendation of project; quality of proposed houses below standard; project not consistent with General Plan housing element;
7 Dec 95	Applicant letter to DERA – re: applicant opposes increasing the height of the sound wall to 7.5' rather than the 6' initially required;
11 Dec 95	Policy Planning Commission meeting: project discussed and continued to next meeting;
8 Jan 96	Legal Services of Northern California fax letter to Applicant – re: new condition of approval included that mandates 15% of the units be sold according to county affordability guidelines;
8 Jan 96	Policy Planning Commission meeting: project approved; variance approved to allow private streets, deviating lot areas, driveways and street standards; eight minimal findings included; conditions of approval amended to include 15% affordability requirement;
undated	Notice of Public Hearing for Policy Planning Commission meeting of 27 Jan 96;
11 Jan 96	Policy Planning Commission letter to Applicant – re: notification of project approval;
16 Feb 96	Planning Department document inventory check list for project;
21& 22 Jan 97	Final Map approved;
26 Feb 97	Plan set submitted for master plan check;
Mar 97	Master plan check approved for building permit;
11 Apr 97	Building Permit Application submitted for models;
11 Apr 97	Building Permits issued for models;

California Department Housing and Community Development

Oct 97	Sales office at models opened;
Oct 97	Building Permits finalized for models;
29 Apr 98	Last Building Inspection / Permit action on models;
Aug 98	Models open; 17 houses constructed and sold in Phase 1; construction and sales proceeding.

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by County:	1 Aug 1995 - 8 Jan 1996 = 5.25 months
Building Permit Approval:	26 Feb 1997 - 17 Mar 1997 = .75 months
Building Construction Period for models:	11 Apr 1997 - Oct 1997 = 6.5 months
Building Construction Period for others:	Nov 1997 - Aug 1998 = 10 months thus far

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received significant opposition from neighbors and the local Advisory Council. Sacramento County requires that local Advisory Councils composed of local residents make recommendations on all projects to the various Planning Commissions. The Franklin / Laguna Creek Planning Advisory Council recommended denial of the project for a variety of reasons related to the site and proposed house designs, the presence of a gated community in the area, the low-income nature of the development, and the contrast to other single family projects in the area. **Although the Advisory Council recommended denial of the project, the Policy Planning Commission found no reason to reject the project, since it met all zoning and General Plan criteria.**

CITY OF SACRAMENTO:
Coleman Ranch: single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name:</i>	Coleman Ranch
<i>Project Location:</i>	South of Pocket Road and north of the Sacramento River in southwest Sacramento models at 996, 998 and 1000 Glide Ferry Way
<i>Developer:</i>	Parker Development Company 8144 Pocket Road, Sacramento California 95831 916 427 2936
<i>Owner:</i>	L & P – Pacific, Teichert 8144 Pocket Road, Sacramento California 95831 916 427 2936
<i>Project Components:</i>	-53 units on 12.2 acres = 4.34 units / acre -60 lots total: 53 residential, 1 street lot, 4 landscape lots, 1 river parkway lot, and 1 open space lot -eight floor plans with two elevations each -Plan 1: Rio – 4 bdrm / 2.5 ba / 2 car garage @ 2065 sf -Plan 2: Mandarin – 4 bdrm / 2.5 ba / 2 car garage @ 2354 sf -Plan 3: Malaya – 4 bdrm + den / 3 ba / 3 car garage @ 2602 sf -Plan 4: Riviera – 5 bdrm / 3 ba / 2 car garage @ 2336 sf -Plan 5: Monte Carlo -- 3 bdrm / 2 ba / 2 car garage @ 1749 sf -Plan 6: Casa Blanca --3 bdrm+den/2 ba/2 car garage @ 1508sf -Plan 7: Serengeti – 3 bdrm / 2 ba / 2 car garage @ 1630 sf -Plan 8: Manhattan – 4 bdrm / 2.5 ba / 2 car garage @ 1827 sf -all houses are two stories each -gated community with private streets
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APNs: 031-0112-003, -004, -005 and 031-0120-039, -047 Plan Review: P95-011 Special Permit for perimeter fence Tentative Map Rezone Variance Subdivision Modification (development standards) Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plan PUD Schematic Plan Amendment
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Morton & Pitalo, Inc. Architecture: Emil Benes Associates, Architects & Planners

Project Description:

This single-family gated community is located on the north bank of the Sacramento River in Sacramento. The site is generally flat, but slightly sloping to the river, with a slight north-south swale at the center where significant numbers of mature oak trees are located. The trapezoid shaped site is bounded on the north by the Riverlake single-family residential development across Pocket Road; on the south by the river; on the west by the Betts Property and a single-family subdivision; and on the northeast by an undeveloped single-family PUD.

The site plan is dominated by a single loop road with an internal cul-de-sac, and the stub road to the northeast. Residential lots are located at the edges of all roads, except for the side of the loop road adjacent to the river, which has been left unobscured. The project has two vehicular entrances from Pocket Road: the main vehicular entrance is located at the center of the project, and a secondary emergency access point is located at the northeast corner by means of a stub road and temporary gate to the adjacent PUD. Two landscaped lots are located at the 25' setback along Pocket Road to either side of the primary vehicular entrance. A landscaped median separates inbound and outbound traffic at this main entrance. Two landscaped lots where a large number of heritage oaks are located are directly south of the median at the main entrance, to either side of the loop road.

A large river parkway lot with heritage oaks has been designated at the river levee along a maintenance easement and bikeway path. This parkway lot is separated from the residential development by a wrought iron fence with access gates that are locked at night. The archaeological site is located in the southeast corner of the site and cuts into the adjacent PUD to the east along the river. The "Brazil mound" is located here along with several heritage oaks. This lot will be left as open space.

The houses are designed in a contemporary suburban style with stucco finishes, concrete roof tiles, vinyl windows, and metal roll-up garage doors. The buildings have some detailing on the front elevations, including: brick or cobblestone accents, arched openings, window and door trim, some inoperable shutters, and a few popouts. The buildings have combination gable and hipped roofs across the project site. Eight floor plans with two elevation options each are available to this subdivision, although the same floor plans are also being used for an adjacent project by the same developer.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project site falls under the jurisdiction of the Pocket Community Area Plan. The development of the site required various approvals and permits, including: a Plan Review approval, a Special Permit for perimeter fencing of various materials, a Tentative Map approval, a Rezone from various residential zones to a unified single-family residential zone designation, a variance to exceed lot coverage allowances, a Subdivision Modification with regard to development standards relating to sidewalks, street widths, and the gated community, certification of the Mitigated Negative Declaration, an Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, and a PUD Schematic Plan Amendment to redesignate 12.2 acres from a lower density to a low density residential zone and to remove the northeast corner of the project at the emergency access road (.6 acres) from an adjacent PUD.

The need for emergency access and egress required a stub road to the adjacent lot to the east, to access Pocket Road as a secondary means of egress.

Several environmental issues impacted the development of the site, including the presence of an archaeological site, the need to preserve heritage trees, endangered habitat areas, acoustic problems, and flood plain issues. An archaeologist was required on site during grading to monitor for additional cultural resource findings in close proximity to the existing known site.

Two ranch-style houses, a shop building, and a tank house on the project site required demolition permits and razing prior to construction. In addition a septic tank under the site required removal. The site was originally covered with 163 trees, of which 49 required demolition and replacement elsewhere on the site, to allow improvements and houses to be constructed. The production of an Oak Tree Planting Plan, and the retention of a certified arborist were required to monitor tree demolition and replacement during grading and construction.

California Department Housing and Community Development

Acoustic issues were addressed by the addition of a sound wall at the perimeter of the project site, an adjacent 25' landscaped setback, and extensive insulation of the houses. The developer requested a Special Permit to adjust the sound wall construction requirements—allowing the 7' sound wall to be constructed of wood, concrete, masonry, and brick at Pocket Road.

The site was also designated as a Swainson's Hawk foraging habitat, and required the monitoring and presence of a raptor biologist on site during construction, especially during nesting season March - August.

The location of the site next to the Sacramento River also mandated additional permitting for the project, including: a Reclamation Board permit to deal with potential river flooding, as well as various stormwater requirements and permits. Because of flood control issues, lot pads required elevations 4' above existing grade.

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers and agencies were extensive, and included many additional environmental plans, reports and monitoring as described above. However, few physical changes were made to the project in the process of collecting these comments.

The Planning Department and Planning Commission, however, required minimal redesign to the project. Pedestrian access ways and bike paths were required through the project. The Planning Department requested more housing types to take advantage of river views, and suggested that street-facing garages were too dominant. The Planning Commission, under pressure from those opposed to various aspects of the project, approved a project that was not gated, and specified windows to active living spaces, exterior building finishes and materials, lot coverages, and garage placement. **Most of these Planning Commission changes to the conditions of approval were reversed by the City Council however.**

Fees for the project seem to have been of a standard nature. The applicant and school district did not enter into an independent project impact mitigation agreement, but instead preferred to accept Mello-Roos fees paid over time. The Planning Department required the establishment of a Home Owners Association to maintain the private roads and landscaping on the site. Planning fees were determined on an hourly basis.

No change in the unit count was noted in the project file through the course of the approvals process.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

1 Nov 84	Archaeological Mitigation Plan for archaeological site California-SAC-43 (the Brazil mound) by Peak and Assoc, Inc. details native American burial site located at the current project site;
1 Dec 92	City Council approves Pocket Community Plan;
6 Sept 94	Subdivision Review Committee (SRC) approves project with conditions of approval;
29 Dec 94	City Real Estate Consultant letter to Applicant – re: bikeway easement to river required;
31 Jan 95	Public Works waiver of information for Tentative Map processing: soils report and preliminary grading plan;
31 Jan 95	Application for Subdivision Modification submitted to allow private streets;
31 Jan 95	Application submitted to Planning Department;
undated	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: project planning fees of \$16,195 for applications;
15 Feb 95	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of incomplete application; list of revised entitlement requirements and fees required of \$3551.25;
17 Feb 95	City Real Estate Consultant letter to Applicant – re: follow up of earlier letter concerning the bikeway easement;
7 Mar 95	Engineer's submittals: zoning map and revised PUD maps;
9 Mar 95	Project routed to agencies for tentative map review; extensive agency review list;
14 Mar 95	Planning Department letter to Native American Heritage Commission – re: archaeological site discovered on adjacent property; Planning Department seeking comments and direction;

California Department Housing and Community Development

14 Mar 95 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: letter of agency required to allow Mr. Solon Wisham to speak on behalf of Applicant and project;

20 Mar 95 Sacramento Municipal Utility District comments: easements delineated;

20 Mar 95 Sacramento City Unified School District comments: project site within city's Mello-Roos district;

20 Mar 95 Applicant letter to Planning Department – re: agency for project extended to Mr. Solon Wisham;

21 Mar 95 Transportation Planning comments: development standards for streets delineated;

21 Mar 95 Pacific Bell comments: easements delineated;

22 Mar 95 Fire Department comments: revisions made to site plan requiring more open space;

23 Mar 95 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: TAC meeting with several comments forwarded; development standards for project discussed;

23 Mar 95 Utilities Department comments: extensive comments on various requirements;

27 Mar 95 Building Inspections comments;

31 Mar 95 Waste Disposal comments;

3 Apr 95 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: invitation to agency coordination meeting to discuss project;

4 Apr 95 PG&E comments: easements delineated; services available to project site;

7 Apr 95 Agency coordination meeting: project discussed and agency comments collected and summarized;

9 Apr 95 Planning Department fax to Applicant – re: area plan development standards;

undated USACE letter: site is located within FEMA's 100 year flood plain;

18 May 95 Early project notification to Neighborhood Associations;

19 May 95 Building Inspections comments;

25 May 95 Citywide Planning Department comments: request for more housing types to take advantage of river views; garages too dominant;

30 May 95 Sacramento Municipal Utility District comments: same as previous;

31 May 95 Utilities Department comments: clarifications on earlier comments;

31 May 95 Transportation Division comments;

2 June 95 Planning Department fax to Applicant – re: tree preservation

9 June 95 Sacramento City Unified School District comments: same as previous;

13 June 95 Applicant letter to Planning Department – re: request for city to maintain street lights, water, sewer, drainage facilities while retaining the gated community aspect of the project; Home Owners Association to maintain streets;

22 June 95 Applicant letter to Planning Department – re: temporary access road request;

23 June 95 Engineer's submittal of revised tentative map;

23 June 95 Application deemed complete;

27 June 95 Fire Department comments;

27 June 95 Planning Department fax to Engineer – re: subdivision map changes;

6 July 95 Utilities Department comments: easements for utilities delineated;

13 July 95 Initial Study by Planning Department: Mitigated Negative Declaration recommended with extensive notes on mitigations and potential impacts;

19 July 95 SRC meeting: project discussed and continued to next meeting of 2 Aug 95;

20 July 95 Mitigation agreement signed by Applicant;

2 Aug 95 SRC meeting: revised conditions of approval; lengthy discussion of conditions at this meeting;

4 Aug 95 Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 24 Aug 95;

4 Aug 95 Tree Care Incorporated letter to Applicant – re: tree preservation options during construction;

22 Aug 95 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: letter of opposition from Sacramento River Parkway Advocates forwarded to Applicant;

23 Aug 95 Project routed to agencies for environmental comments;

23 Aug 95 State Lands Commission letter to Planning Department – re: comments on parkway, bikeway and greenway plans; public access to river required despite the fact that the development is a gated community; discussion of riparian restoration potential; project consistency with the goals of the Sacramento River Parkway Association at odds; this group is opposed to the project;

California Department Housing and Community Development

24 Aug 95 Planning Commission meeting: project discussed and continued to next meeting of 14 Sept 95;
 25 Aug 95 Applicant letter to City Arborist – re: remedial measures for tree preservation proposed;
 31 Aug 95 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: tree mitigation language revision in conditions of approval;
 31 Aug 95 State Reclamation Board comments: flood zone permit required for project;
 31 Aug 95 Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 14 Sept 95;
 31 Aug 95 City Attorney memo to Planning Department – re: bicycle and pedestrian access easements required through project to river;
 5 Sept 95 Planning Department fax to Applicant – re: revised conditions of approval;
 6 Sept 95 SRC meeting: conditions approved with revisions; pedestrian access to river required;
 6 Sept 95 Transportation and Engineering comments and conditions submitted;
 7 Sept 95 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: forward of Staff Report to Applicant;
 7 Sept 95 Planning Department letter to Public Works / and Real Estate Consultant – re: land dedication;
 12 Sept 95 Applicant letter to City Real Estate Consultant – re: dedication of 2.3 acre Lot C at river's edge to city in-lieu of park fee assessment proposed;
 14 Sept 95 Staff Report to Planning Commission: recommends approval of project with conditions of approval; new proposal very well designed; project preserves many existing oak trees; no sidewalks included in project; request for river parkway and bikeway land dedication to city;
14 Sept 95 Planning Commission meeting: project and some of the permits approved; several resolutions with extensive findings discussed and passed; 32 conditions of approval and 3 advisory notes given approval, including: requirement for an independent mitigation agreement with the Sacramento City Unified School District, the maximum lot coverage is set at 55%, and only 50% of houses can exceed 40% lot coverage; Special permit for mixed-material fence approved; Commission makes changes to some of the conditions recommended by staff including: disallowment of gated community, requirements with regard to materials, window placement and garages facing side yards;
 14 Sept 95 Letter of Opposition received from neighbors – re: opposition to gated community and limited river access;
 15 Sept 95 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of Planning Commission decisions and changes to conditions of approval;
 21 Sept 95 Planning Department fax to Applicant's Attorney – re: appeal application; process delineated;
22 Sept 95 Appeal of Planning Commission decision by the Applicant; with regard to the Special Permit and the tentative map disallowing the gated community; several new conditions also appealed including: requirement that 50% of the units have side facing garages, requirement specifying the exact materials the units are to be finished with, and requirement that windows from active living spaces within the house face the street;
 25 Sept 95 \$110 appeal fee paid;
 17 Oct 95 Planning Department fax to Applicant's Attorney – re: next available Council opening is 28 Nov 95;
 20 Oct 95 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: City Council hearing for appeal scheduled for 31 Oct 95;
 20 Oct 95 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: Staff Report for City Council appeal hearing forwarded to Applicant;
22 Oct 95 Planning Commission meeting: the rest of the permits and entitlements are approved; Pocket Community Area Plan amendment to remove .65 acres from the adjacent area plan and include it in this area plan; variance approved to allow lots to back up to river and allow a rear yard setback adjustment at the river; zone change approved; Tentative Map and subdivision modification to adjust lot and street standards approved;
 23 Oct 95 Additional Planning Department fees paid of \$877.50 for extended staff hours on project;
 25 Oct 95 Notice of Public Hearing for City Council meeting to hear appeal of Planning Commission approval of project and all entitlements;

California Department Housing and Community Development

31 Oct 95	City Council meeting to hear Planning Commission appeal: project approved and most appeals granted; approved amendment to South Pocket Community Area Plan; all of Applicant's appeals wishes acceded to; several resolutions passed;
31 Oct 95	Notice of Determination submitted to County Clerk—Mitigated Negative Declaration; findings were not made;
30 Aug 96	Planning Department letter to Native American Heritage Commission – re: follow up letter;
18 Sept 97	Permit granted to remove or trim heritage trees;
Aug 98	Building permits have been granted for several of the houses, but this information – or the approval times -- was not readily accessible within the project files.

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City: 31 Jan 1995 - 31 Oct 1995 = 9 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received some degree of opposition from neighbors and the public. One letter of opposition was received from a neighbor with regard to the gated aspect of the project, as well as opposition to closing off access to the Sacramento River. Additional opposition was voiced by the public at the Planning Commission meeting, which resulted in the Commission's revision to the conditions of approval with respect to gating the project. The Commission also imposed more stringent design guidelines involving materials and garage placement. All of these changes were overturned by the City Council through the appeals process.

CITY OF SALINAS:
Williams Ranch: single-family subdivision

Project Name	Williams Ranch Phase II Chaparral and Briarwood model lines
Project Location:	Williams Ranch, northeast Salinas between East Boronda Road and Freedom Parkway north of North Sanborn Road
Developer:	DUC Development Co. 16795 Lark Avenue Ste. 101, Los Gatos California 95030 408 395 2858 Award Homes Standard Pacific Homes
Owner:	Flick, Inc. PO Box 310, Menlo Park California 94026
Project Components:	-Williams Ranch Phase II (WR total area @ 464 acres) -6 subdivisions / areas -440 total units on 80.73 acres = 5.45 units per acre -area 1 = 82 lots @ 5200 sf min -area 2 = 21 lots @ 4000 sf min + 28 lots @ 5200 sf min -area 3 = 101 lots @ 4000 sf min: -area 4 = 81 lots @ 5200 sf min. -area 5 = 82 lots @ 5200 sf min. -area 6 = 45 lots @ 5500 sf min. -Briarwood model line -plan 1 = 3 bdrm @ 1475 sf ea. -plan 2 = 4 bdrm @ 1697 sf ea. -plan 3 = 4 bdrm @ 1784 sf ea. -Chaparral model line -plan 1 = 4 bdrm @ 1824 sf ea. -plan 2 = 4 bdrm @ 2105 sf ea. -plan 3 = 4 bdrm @ 2258 sf ea. -plan 4 = 4 bdrm w. optional den @ 2403 sf ea. -3 car garages optional on several models -developer not particular about keeping the lines segregated by phase, lot size or planning area of Williams Ranch -2 open space lots at the seasonal creek to the north of the property
Project Numbers:	APN: 153-102-017 Rezone 96-3 Tentative Tract Map 96-2
Project Consultants:	Civil Engineering: H. D. Peters Co.

Project Description:

This development phase of Williams Ranch in northeast Salinas is extremely typical of housing developments across the state. There is little to the project that is extraordinary. 6 parcels with 18 construction phases are located in the northeast quadrant of Williams Ranch. To the east is East Boronda Road and some commercial, multi-family and institutional parcels of Williams Ranch; to the north is a 41 acre Williams Ranch park parcel; to the west are Williams Ranch single family parcels and Freedom Parkway; and to the south are medium and high density parcels along North Sanborn Road. The site is bisected by Rider Avenue, which connects East Boronda Road with Freedom Parkway. To the north of Rider Avenue are large lot parcels, and to the south is low and medium density development. Rider Avenue provides access to most of the loop roads in the individual parcels. Each development parcel is dominated by a single loop road with only a few internal cul de sacs scattered throughout the development. The streets and site plan are extremely inward looking with the backs of houses to the main streets. Natividad Creek runs through the project area, separating parcel 6 (the largest lots) from the other 5 development parcels. The developer was required to construct East Boronda Road across this creek to provide access to future development to the north of Williams Ranch.

The houses are typical of middle-income subdivision development. They are clad in the perfunctory stucco plaster and flat concrete roof tiles. They are designed in a contemporary Mediterranean style in earth tones with exposed beams and outlookers at the gable ends. Masonry veneers are applied to the front facades; the other three elevations are stripped bare. Foam / stucco trim surrounds the windows and doors on the front elevations only. Garages dominate the front elevations.

Planning and Development Issues:

Although a Precise Plan and Development Agreement had been adopted in previous years, the actual rezoning of the land at Williams Ranch occurs at the time of parcel development; thus a rezone from agricultural use to a variety of low and medium density residential uses was required for Phase II. Otherwise the planning issues were fairly straight forward on this project, just a tentative tract map was necessary.

The project is however in a 100 year flood plain and an area of wetlands and riparian vegetation exists along the seasonal creek to the north of the project. This creek required construction of a new 6 lane road (East Boronda Road), bridge and culvert over Natividad Creek. The area surrounding the creek, has been left as open space with a 100' buffer to the developable area.

Key Project Adjustments:

Only a few project adjustments were noted from agencies or the community. In addition to the requisite payment of impact fees, the developer was required to construct East Boronda Road, which was reimbursable by the city. Pedestrian accessways were also required through the development, along with a sound wall around the project perimeter, street trees and median island improvement both on-site and off-site at adjacent roads.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

1984	Williams Ranch project area annexed to city of Salinas as conditional growth area;
1 July 92	Planning Commission meeting to discuss Williams Ranch Development Agreement No. DA 93-1 and Precise Plan for the full 464 acres;
1 July 92	Williams Ranch Precise Plan EIR – referred to the City Council with no recommendation;
21 July 92	City Council meeting to discuss Ordinance No. 2196 and 2197 for Development Agreement No. DA 93-1 and Precise Plan ; continued through next several meetings;
Jan 93	Revised Final Supplemental EIR submitted;

California Department Housing and Community Development

9 Feb 93	Williams Ranch EIR certified by City Council; includes traffic study that recommends traffic impact fee of \$2.46 million;
30 Mar 93	City Council meeting adopted ordinances, precise plan and development agreement with Flick, Inc;
6 July 93	Final planning and environmental documents submitted for City Council review;
22 July 93	Development Agreement signed by all parties;
13 May 94	Williams Ranch EIR Mitigation Monitoring Program; fee paid for library mitigations \$40,625;
18 May 94	Precise Plan Amendment No. 1 application with fee of \$2100;
19 July 94	Staff Report to Council describing Amendment 1 in detail – entails the redistribution of units and densities across 4 parcels of Williams Ranch;
19 July 94	City Council meeting: introduction of Ordinance No. 2230 for Amendment No. 1 to Williams Ranch Precise Plan;
21 July 94	Notice of Determination for Precise Plan Amendment 94-1;
26 July 94	City Council meeting: adoption of Amendment No. 1 to WR Precise Plan;
30 Aug 94	Routing to agencies for comments;
13 Sept 94	Recreation - Park Department Design Review Committee comments;
26 Sep 94	Planning Department meeting with Award Homes – re: phases 2 and 3;
12 Oct 94	Planning Department letter to Award Homes – re: follow-up from previous meeting;
7 Nov 95	Routing to agencies for comments;
21 Nov 95	Public Works revised comments—minimal;
28 Feb 96	Public Works revised comments—access roads and pedestrian access;
9 May 96	Riparian area plan revised;
16 July 96	Development Review Application submitted for rezoning, tentative tract, and environmental review; with fees of \$2721;
30 July 96	Routing to agencies for comments;
6 Aug 96	Recreation - Park Department Design Review Committee comments—street trees required throughout development;
15 Aug 96	Project meeting and Planning Department review;
16 Aug 96	Department Comm Development letter to Engineer – re: requests for changes from previous meeting;
27 Aug 96	Public Works comments—easements and other standard conditions; required island median improvements and landscaping; required 6' and 8' CMU sound wall around non-access frontages;
10 Sept 96	Revised subdivision map submitted;
11 Sept 96	Department Comm Development letter to Applicant's representative – re: schedule of tentative map approval;
18 Sept 96	Planning Commission originally scheduled to review project—project untenable at this time; pushed back to 2 Oct 96;
10 Oct 96	Traffic and Transportation Commission reviews phasing plan;
26 Oct 96	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 6 Nov 96;
6 Nov 96	Planning Commission meeting: recommended approval of rezone and tentative tract;
18 Nov 96	Public Works comments—required 6' and 8' CMU sound wall around non-access frontages;
22 Nov 96	Planning Commission decisions become effective;
3 Dec 96	Staff Report to Council; findings noted—minimal in nature, referring to General Plan and zoning consistency, availability of services, and full physical incorporation into city—not an isolated district of the city;
3 Dec 96	City Council meeting: project approved by unanimous vote; Resolution. No. 16067 for rezone and vesting tract map; in discussing the project, Council required an advance \$200,000 for a further road study (reimbursable at a later date) for impacts related to the development;
17 Dec 96	City Council meeting: 2nd reading of rezone; project effective;
unknown date	Building Permit application date;
15 May 97	Building Permit issue date;
21 July 97	Project reassigned within Planning Department, due to staff shifts;
11 Sept 97	Building Permit finalized; construction of models complete.

California Department Housing and Community Development

16 Oct 97 Notice of Assignment of portion of Williams Ranch Phase II to Standard Pacific;
31 Oct 97 Department Comm Development letter to Flick – re: Standard Pacific’s responsibility to carry out previous Development Agreement No. DA 93-1;
2 Dec 97 USACE pre-construction notification letter – re: riparian restoration and culvert/bridge alternatives by city;
6 Dec 97 Flick Inc letter to Department Comm Development – re: notice of intent to assign property to Standard Pacific;
9 Dec 97 Staff Report to Council;
9 Dec 97 City Council meeting: Resolution. No. 16376 approving an assignment of the interest rights and obligations of the Williams Ranch development agreement from Flick, Inc. to Standard Pacific Corporation for a portion of Phase 2;
9 Dec 97 Standard Pacific Homes letter to Public Works – re: excessive billing by city for developer’s road improvements;
18 Dec 97 US Department of Interior - Fish and Wildlife Service letter – re: suggestion that developer conduct an amphibian inventory to search for the endangered California red-legged frog and the tiger salamander at the construction of the 6 lane free span bridge and culvert over the riparian corridor to the north of the site;
Aug 98 Approximately 124 building permits have been issued thus far; project still in construction.

Total Time for Approvals:

Phase III Project Approval by City: 16 July 1996 - 17 Dec 1996 = 5 months
Building Permit Approval: 15 May 1997
Building Construction of models: 15 May 1997 - 11 Sept 1997 = 4 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

No public participation or opposition from community groups or individuals was noted on the project.

CITY OF SAN JOSE:
White Orchid: single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name</i>	White Orchid
<i>Project Location:</i>	2124 Commodore Drive, San Jose easterly terminus of Commodore Drive and Port Way south of Berryessa Road between Route 680 and Jackson Ave.
<i>Developer:</i>	Citation Homes, Inc. 404 Saratoga Avenue Ste 110, Santa Clara California 95051 408 985 6000 attn: Steve Schott Jr.
<i>Owner:</i>	Citation Homes, and the Frank Nola Family and the Kazuo & Katsumi Miyahara Family
<i>Project Components:</i>	-74 units on 11.9 acres = 6.22 units per acre -avg. lot size = 5450 sf; min lot size = 4300 sf -3 house plans; each with 3 elevations -plan 1 = two story / 4 bdrm @ 2064 sf -plan 2 = two stories / 4 bdrm @ 2245 sf -plan 3 = two stories / 5 bdrm @ 2329 sf
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APNs: 254-15-052, -075 PDC 96-08-044 / PD 96-12-093 / PT 96-12-105
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: MacKay & Somps Architecture: Danielian Associates, Architecture & Planning

Project Description:

The project site is located in southeast San Jose along Highway 680. It is an awkward “L” shaped property from the consolidation of two parcels. The Nola Family parcel forms the bulk of the project area, and the Miyahara property forms a flag of 9 lots extending west along Commodore Drive from the southern border of the property. To the north of the Nola site is vacant agricultural land; to the east is 680; to the south is vacant land and Penetencia Creek that is zoned for future residential development; and to the west are single family residences.

The project is a standard housing subdivision with a single access point from Commodore Drive connecting to a main access road that turns left along the west side of the property—stubbing out at the north boundary to the site. Four cul-de-sacs connecting to this main access road head off to the east. This subdivision completes the existing pattern of streets and lots along Commodore Drive. The houses are designed in the ubiquitous contemporary Mediterranean style: stucco plaster finish, stone and brick veneer details on the front facade, concrete tile roofs, sliding windows with insert muntins, built-up foam/stucco window and door trim, wood fascias, and inoperable wood shutters. The building is detailed with various volumetric elements on the front elevation, but the other three elevations are stripped bare. The houses are dominated on the front elevation by 2 car garages with roll-up doors.

California Department Housing and Community Development

Planning and Development Issues:

The project required a rezone from vacant agricultural use to medium density residential use prior to application for the Planned Development.

The site is located in FEMA's 100 year flood plain zone, within the immediate area of upper Penetencia Creek and its riparian corridor. No impacts to the riparian corridor were anticipated from the project. The local water district was planning a flood control project by-pass channel for the creek.

The Planning Department required a street stub to the adjacent property to the northwest for future development access.

Key Project Adjustments:

In the course of the approvals process, few agencies mandated any additions to the project, save for the Public Works Department that required off-site street improvements at Jackson Avenue and open fencing along the Penetencia Creek riparian corridor.

The developer initially proposed 3 car garages for the units, however these were rejected by the Planning Department as inconsistent with local design guidelines.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

28 June 96	Title Report for Nola Family land;
26 July 96	Affidavit of ownership for Nola Family land;
2 Aug 96	Planned Development Zoning Application submitted with fee of \$11,657; Project at 63 units only on Nola Family land, Miyahara land along Commodore Drive not incorporated into project yet;
5 Aug 96	Public Works fee of \$1210 paid by developer;
7 Aug 96	Berryessa Union SD letter to Planning Department – re: opposition to project due to over capacity of current schools;
14 Aug 96	Santa Clara County Roads and Airports comments—none;
15 Aug 96	Public Works comments—minor;
16 Aug 96	Berryessa Union SD 2 nd letter to Planning Department – re: still opposed to project;
16 Aug 96	Fire Department comments—standard;
30 Aug 96	Planning Department preliminary review of project;
5 Sept 96	Title Report for Miyahara land;
6 Sept 96	Berryessa Union SD 3 rd letter to Planning Department – re: still opposed to project;
9 Sept 96	Pesticide Report—no detection of chemicals to any significant level;
17 Sept 96	Engineer's drawings dated;
2 Oct 96	Planned Development Zoning Application revision submitted with fee of \$864; Miyahara lands now incorporated into the project bringing total unit count to 74 lots;
6 Oct 96	Berryessa Union SD 4 th letter to Planning Department – re: still opposed to project;
9 Oct 96	Routing of project to agencies for comment;
11 Oct 96	Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority comments—none;
18 Oct 96	Fire Department comments—standard comments and conditions;
18 Oct 96	Police Department comments—standard safety comments;
21 Oct 96	Public Works comments—fees are paid;
23 Oct 96	Application for Environmental Clearance; with the following documents included: Soils Report with insignificant trace levels of DDT, and an Archaeological Report showing no cultural resource sites on the project property despite evidence of other cultural resource sites in the area;

California Department Housing and Community Development

23 Oct 96	Notice of Public Hearing: for Planning Commission meeting of 13 Nov 96 and City Council meeting of 3 Dec 96;
23 Oct 96	Initial Study completed; Negative Declaration recommended and circulated to agencies for comment;
23 Oct 96	California Department of Fish & Game: De Minimus Impact Finding and fee exemption;
23 Oct 96	Santa Clara County Roads and Airports comments—none;
6 Nov 96	Planning Department approval and favorable recommendation of project;
8 Nov 96	Police Department comments—none;
12 Nov 96	City Council meeting: certification of Negative Declaration;
13 Nov 96	Planning Commission meeting: zone change adopted and recommended to City Council; no opposition to project presented;
25 Nov 96	Santa Clara Valley Water District comments—project site requires USACE review due to flood control at the creek to the south of the project site;
3 Dec 96	City Council meeting: adoption of Ord. No. 25222 to prezone / rezone the project site from agricultural (A) use to Planned Development (PD) use; unanimously adopted;
10 Dec 96	Application submittal date with fee of \$8431.50 and Affidavits of Ownership; for PD and PT Permits;
11 Dec 96	Amended application submitted for Planned Development Permit;
11 Dec 96	Project Application Summary by Planning Department staff;
17 Dec 96	City Council meeting: second reading of Ord. No. 25222 approving pre zoning / rezoning;
20 Dec 96	Berryessa Union SD 5 th letter to Planning Department – re: still opposed to project;
24 Dec 96	Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority comments—none;
30 Dec 96	Cal Trans comments—such close proximity to I-680 poses impacts to the project; DOT recommends complete traffic study for the project;
1 Jan 97	Police Department comments—none;
9 Jan 97	Public Works comments—project needs soils and grading report; developer needs to dedicated public ROWs to city; public street improvements to Public Works Department standards; Developer to reimburse city for Jackson Avenue improvements; open fencing requirement on Commodore Drive lots;
10 Jan 97	Fire Department comments—standard;
15 Jan 97	Preliminary Review Planning Department comments—early review as per Permit Streamlining Act;
5 Mar 97	Notice of Public Hearing mailed to residents for Planning Commission meeting of 19 Mar 97;
19 Mar 97	Planning Commission meeting: approval of project permits: Planned Development Permit 96-12-093 and PT 96-12-105 for Planned Tract Tentative Map to subdivide two parcels into 74;
11 Apr 97	Planned Development Permit issued with conditions: standard conditions relating to permits, clearances and fees;
21 May 97	Permit acceptance, agreement and consent for PD 96-12-093;
27 June 97	Effective date of Planned Development Permit; due to late payment of fees;
unknown date	Building Permit application date;
unknown date	Building Permit issue date;

California Department Housing and Community Development

Total Time for Approvals:

Rezoning by City:	2 Aug 1996 - 3 Dec 1996 = 4 months
Environmental Clearance by City:	23 Oct 1996 - 12 Nov 1996 = .75 months (overlap with previous)
Planned Development Permit Approval by City:	10 Dec 1996 - 27 June 1997 = 6.75 months
Building Permit Approval:	
Building Construction Period:	- current

Public Participation / Opposition:

There was little public opposition by individuals or community groups to the project. The Berryessa Union School District opposed the project throughout the approval process. This was resolved with payment of standard building area assessment fees and an “irrevocable presumptive payment” to the local school districts.

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY:
Sungate: single-family subdivision & condos

<i>Project Name:</i>	Sungate
<i>Project Location:</i>	5026 Hollister Avenue corner of Hollister Avenue and San Marcos Road in south coast area of Goleta
<i>Developer:</i>	Richard L. Ridgeway 2016 State Street, Santa Barbara California 93105 805 569 1961 Jeff Nelson 112 E. Victoria Street, Santa Barbara California 93101 805 966 1501
<i>Owner:</i>	Sungate Associates 2016 State Street, Santa Barbara California 93105 805 569 1961
<i>Project Components:</i>	-48 total units on 11.89 acres = 4.04 units per acre - five construction phases: 1 grading + 4 bldg phases -36 single family houses -plan A: 3 bdrm, 1 story, 2 car garage = 9 units @ 1835 sf -plan B: 3 bdrm, 1 story, 2 car garage = 8 units @ 1957 sf -plan C: 3 bdrm, 2 story, 2 car garage = 9 units @ 2158 sf -plan D: 3 bdrm, 2 story, 3 car garage = 10 units @ 2293 sf -all with porches, driveways, front- and backyards; -minimal curbside parking, only 13 visitor parking spaces -12 affordable condominium units in two sizes -plan E: 2 bdrm, 2 story, 1 car garage = 6 units @ 1147 sf -plan F: 3 bdrm, 2 story, 1 car garage = 6 units @ 943 sf -4 of 12 condo units = very-low income for 15 years -4 of 12 condo units = low-moderate income for 15 years -4 of 12 condo units = low-moderate income for 30 year -20 uncovered space reserved for units and visitors -playfield, swimming pool with changing rooms/restrooms, picnic and BBQ areas
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APNs: 65-690-01 through -44; 65-080-12 95-RMM-2 93-DPF-5 RVO1 93-RZ-002 93-SD-1 TM-14,297
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Flowers and Associates Architecture: Murray Duncan Architects, Inc. Landscape Architecture: Katie O'Reilly Rogers, ASLA

Project Description:

This housing subdivision is located in the south-coast area of Goleta in unincorporated Santa Barbara County. To the north of the project site are greenhouses and nursery uses; to the southeast are GTE facilities; to the south are residences across Hollister Road; to the east is San Marcos Road and a wholesale nursery; and to the west is an avocado orchard. Vehicular access to the site is from San Marcos Road, where there are located two main entrances with landscaped median islands to the site at the north and the south of the project. A recreation area, with a swimming pool, cabanas, a tennis court, tot lots, a large playing field, and a spa are located near the center of the project. Large landscaped setbacks were required by the county on the south and east sides along the major access roads. The project design calls for extensive landscaping and enhanced hardscape materials at the primary entrances. A sound wall is located along Hollister Road.

The site plan is composed of three cul-de-sacs (two of which begin at the vehicular entrance and terminating on the west side of the property). The third cul-de-sac is located between the other two and a connecting road that runs north-south connects all of these cul-de-sacs together. The recreation center is located to the north of this central cul-de-sac. There is little curbside parking, except for a few visitor spaces near to the recreation center in the center of the development. The lots are very large and the front yards are expected to be landscaped heavily based on the landscape drawings. The condo units are formed into fourplexes with 4 townhouses for each development. The condos are located in the far northwest corner of the development with shared uncovered parking between the units.

The buildings are designed in a suburban Victorian style. The gable-roofed buildings are finished with wood siding for the walls, flat concrete tiles for the roof, some masonry veneers on the front elevation, and painted wood fascias. Victorian-style wood brackets have been installed for decorative purposes at the main gable end elements.

Planning and Development Issues:

The original project required litigation against the county to get approved. The project was denied repeatedly for a number of reasons. The county ended up settling with the developer; a settlement that included the approval of a new project-- the topic of this case study. The proposed settlement agreement also mandated the affordable condominiums that were included in the project. The original condition for these units required a 30 year control on resale of the units, but that was later changed to a 10 year shared equity agreement.

The original project proposal required a rezoning from agricultural use to residential uses at 4.6 du/acre, the final project density was slightly lower after unit count changes. It also required a full EIR due to many significant impacts. This was approved by B. of Supervisor on 24 August 89. This EIR was completed in 1984 with later supplemental EIR for the current application in 1993.

The project went through several rounds of approvals, with denials from the Board of Supervisors on every proposal until the applicant took the county to court. A settlement agreement was approved early in the current approvals process that allowed the proposal to be reviewed. The settlement agreement outlined many physical and agency requirements for project development.

The site was vacant prior to construction, but required the removal of several 8" diameter eucalyptus trees to accommodate the buildings.

The project site required a good deal of grading: 14,500 cy of cut and 8100 cy of fill.

Demolition of several structures was required prior to project construction: one single family residence, two corrugated sheds, and one tank house. The site is graded prime agricultural land and also required the demolition of an operating lemon orchard, a few avocado trees, and the removal of some palm trees.

California Department Housing and Community Development

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers were generally of a standard nature. Several agencies required mitigation fees to allow the development, including: \$28,080 for parks, ± \$180,000 for traffic impacts, \$16,800 for the Fire Department, \$800 to LAFCO, and \$2.65 per sf to the school districts.

The project was redesigned several times due to the repeated denials from the Board of Supervisors. The final number of units was reduced by 4 from the initial proposal of 52 units to the final approved 48 units. The conditions of the settlement agreement and the final approval from the Board of Supervisors included several mandates with respect to the site planning and design of the development: large setbacks from all sides of the parcel boundary, landscaping at Hollister and San Marcos Road, a sound wall at Hollister Road, and a transit stop at the project boundary, to name a few.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

Aug 84	52 unit project originally prepared;
Aug 84	EIR completed;
Nov 84	Application submitted for 52 unit project;
16 Dec 85	Board of Supervisors meeting: approved General Plan amendment for site density to 4.6 dwelling units per acre;
13 Jan 86	Board of Supervisors meeting: project denied; request for redesign;
12 Feb 86	2 nd application submitted for 52 unit project;
July 86	Application revised to reduce unit count to 48;
27 July 87	Board of Supervisors meeting: project denied for second time;
24 Aug 89	Board of Supervisors meeting: project denied for third time; project not in the interest of the general community and not consistent with the General Plan designation and zoning that recommends agricultural or agriculturally serving uses; project is also not consistent with good planning practice; findings could not be made for project;
undated	Applicant takes legal action against Board of Supervisors for approval of project. County agrees to settlement with project approval as part of settlement;
18 Sept 92	Court Order for settlement of Case No. 169650;
17 Dec 92	Case No. 168650 settled: Sungate Associates vs. County of Santa Barbara: memorandum of understanding signed by all parties; settlement allows 36 units of 1800 sf - 2000 sf with private streets; Conditions of Approval per 1987 staff recommendations to the Planning Commission apply; deep setbacks all around project are imposed – 30' at the west; 40' at the north; 30' at San Marcos Road; and 40' landscaped setback at Hollister Road;
8 Jan 93	CC& R's for project prepared by Little & Saputo, Attorneys at Law;
2 Feb 93	Applicant letter to Goleta Water District – re: request for services;
11 Feb 93	Engineer's submittals;
12 Feb 93	Application submitted with \$5000 rezone fee and \$4180 for other permits;
16 Feb 93	Applicant letter to Goleta Sanitary District -- re: request for annexation to district per 1985 application;
16 Feb 93	Project routed to agencies for comments;
18 Feb 93	Applicant letter to Planning Department – re: project timeline;
18 Feb 93	Title Report and Title Insurance;
19 Feb 93	Southern California Gas Co comments—gas facilities exist in area already;
23 Feb 93	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: notification of incomplete application;
25 Feb 93	Initial Planning Department review with conditions and comments;
25 Feb 93	Subdivision / Development Review Committee meeting;
26 Feb 93	Additional submittals from Architect and Applicant;
26 Feb 93	Architect letter to Planning Department – re: responses to incomplete application letter;

California Department Housing and Community Development

26 Feb 93	Applicant letter to Planning Department – re: responses to incomplete application letter;
28 Feb 93	Goleta Sanitary District letter to Applicant – re: new application required;
1 Mar 93	Applicant fax to Planning Department – re: settlement conditions;
1 Mar 93	Applicant fax to Planning Department – re: phasing schedule;
1 Mar 93	Additional submittals from Architect and Applicant;
2 Mar 93	Parks Department comments;
3 Mar 93	Resources Management Department letter to Applicant – re: application complete;
3 Mar 93	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: development issues;
4 Mar 93	Resources Management Department letter to Applicant – street names have been selected;
4 Mar 93	Fire Department comments;
4 Mar 93	Air Pollution Control District comments;
9 Mar 93	Planning Department letter to Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District – re: transit impacts;
9 Mar 93	Architect letter to Planning Department – re: issues for determination of project completeness;
9 Mar 93	Applicant letter to Goleta Union SD – re: opposition to any fees other than those mandated by state;
11 Mar 93	Applicant letter to Resources Management Department / County Counsel – re: stipulation for the settlement that the rezone request is within the scope of the Goleta Community Plan;
12 Mar 93	Additional submittals from Architect and Applicant;
12 Mar 93	Applicant letter to Resources Management Department – re: responses to RMD letter;
19 Mar 93	Architect letter to Resources Management Department – re: issues required for application completion;
22 Mar 93	Initial Study for Environmental Assessment – recommends a supplemental EIR to 85EIR-6; potentially significant impacts noted with regard to circulation, agricultural land loss, and schools;
30 Mar 93	Request for mailing list for residents in area;
31 Mar 93	Applicant letter to Resources Management Department – re: Initial Study comments;
31 Mar 93	Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District comments—developer shall install transit stop facilities;
2 Apr 93	Board of Architectural Review meeting for in-house referral;
5 Apr 93	Letter of Opposition from Bobbi McGinnis;
12 Apr 93	Supplemental EIR submitted with notice to home buyers included with regard to agricultural nuisances; mitigation monitoring plan included;
12 Apr 93	Notice of Application Completion and Notice of Public Hearing for SEIR for 6 May 93 environmental hearing;
12 Apr 93	Draft Supplemental EIR released for public comment;
14 Apr 93	Goleta Union School District letter to county – re: EIR process follow up to letter by Applicant;
16 Apr 93	Letter of Opposition from the Walsworth Family Trust – re: increasing urbanization;
25 Apr 93	Letter of Opposition from the Bauers – re: air pollution and traffic impacts;
4 May 93	Notice of Public Hearing for Board of Supervisors meeting on 25 May 93;
5 May 93	Environmental Health comments—none;
5 May 93	Letter of Opposition from Kenworthy – re: urbanization at any density and impacted schools and streets;
6 May 93	Resources Management Department meeting for approval of Rezone, Tentative Map and Development Plan; several residents opposed the project based on noise impacts and cumulative development impacts that have never been addressed; continued to next meeting on 12 May 93;
8 May 93	Letter of Opposition from Jeffreys – re: traffic, noise and affordable housing issues;
10 May 93	Letter of Opposition from Nusmans;
10 May 93	Flood Control District comments;
11 May 93	Applicant's attorney letter to Resources Mgmt Department – re: many objections to supplemental EIR mitigations;
11 May 93	Hollister Elementary School District letter to Board of Supervisors – re: letter of opposition / support, due to impacted schools—but appreciative of lower density development such as this one;

California Department Housing and Community Development

12 May 93	Draft Supplemental EIR comment period closes;
12 May 93	Resources Management Department meeting;
12 May 93	Applicant letter to Fire Department – re: Fire Department turn around and parking configuration;
13 May 93	Applicant letter to Resources Management Department – re: street names and landscape issues;
18 May 93	Revised site plan submitted;
18 May 93	Applicant letter to Resources Management Department – re: site design changes for parking and backyards;
20 May 93	Resources Management Department letter to Board – re: request for continuation to give staff more time; continued to meeting of 8 June 93;
21 May 93	Environmental Health Services comments;
24 May 93	Applicant letter to Resources Management Department – re: schedule for Board of Supervisors meeting if supplemental materials are not ready in time or submitted;
25 May 93	Letter of Opposition from McCloskey Nursery;
25 May 93	Final Supplemental EIR dated;
25 May 93	Notice of Final SEIR;
25 May 93	Board of Supervisors meeting: continued to next meeting on 8 June 93;
28 May 93	Resources Management Department letter to Board – re: project submittals for review;
28 May 93	Public Works comments;
2 June 93	Applicant letter to Resources Management Department – re: conditions of approval;
4 June 93	Applicant letter to Bd. of Supervisors – letter of support for project;
8 June 93	Staff Report for Board meeting;
8 June 93	Board of Supervisors meeting: project discussed and continued to meeting of 22 June 93;
8 June 93	Proposed condition revisions – re: school mitigation fees vis-a-vis affordable housing rental prices;
8 June 93	CEQA findings and statement of overriding consideration drawn up for rezone, tentative tract map, and development plan; extensive findings in 6 pages;
22 June 93	Board of Supervisors meeting: approval of project and settlement agreement; 24 conditions of approval for vesting to Tentative Tract Map, including requirements for a Home Owners Association, undergrounding of utilities, various indemnifications for county; 37 conditions of approval for DPF; certified SEIR 93-SD-1; approved rezone; approved DPF;
28 June 93	Resources Management Department letter to Applicant – re: notice of Board approval with various conditions;
29 June 93	De Minimus Impact Finding and Certificate of Fee Exemption from California Department of Fish & Game;
30 June 93	Notice of Determination filed with County;
24 Sept 93	Case No. 186942 for re-entry of judgment;
30 Sept 93	Case No. 168650 – re: approval of settlement agreement by the Superior Court;
unknown date	Building Permit application submitted;
unknown date	Building Permit issued;

Total Time for Approvals:

Denials by City:	Nov 1984 - 24 Aug 1989 = 4 years 10 months
Current Project Approval by City:	12 Feb 1993 - 22 June 1993 = 4.25 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received substantial opposition from neighbors and other groups. The county agreed with the letters of opposition that were received throughout the life of the approval process and denied the project several times. The developer filed suit against the county to win approval of this project.

CITY OF SANTA CLARITA:
Sunset Hills: single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name:</i>	Sunset Hills
<i>Project Location:</i>	Southerly Terminus of May Way at Via Princesa in the Canyon Country section of eastern Santa Clarita
<i>Developer:</i>	P & V Enterprises 9229 Sunset Blvd, Suite 616 Los Angeles, California 90069 William S. Hart Union High School District, and Western Pacific Housing / Los Angeles Division
<i>Owner:</i>	Friendly Valley Equestrian Condo View Homes 6255 Sunset Blvd, 20th Floor Hollywood, California 90029 and William S. Hart Union High School District
<i>Project Components:</i>	-161 lots on 62.8 acres + 1 Jr. High School on 17.2 acres -2.56 dwelling units per acre -two series (Signature and Estate) in var. construction phases -avg. lot size = 11,477 sf; min lot size = 5,325 -3 house plans in each series; each with 3 elevations -Signature Series: w/ 2 car garage (3 car optional on pl. 2 & 3) -plan 1 = single story / 3 br, 2 ba @ 1343 sf -plan 2 = single story / 3 br, 2 ba @ 1579 sf -plan 3 = two stories / 4 br, 3 ba @ 1830 sf -Estate Series: ea. w/ 3 car garage -plan 1 = single story / 4 br, 2 ba @ 1961 sf -plan 2 = two stories / 4 br, 2.5 ba @ 2240 sf -plan 3 = two stories / 4 br, 3 ba @ 2425 sf
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APNs: 2864-002-002, -005, -009, -010 Tentative Tract: 48108 Conditional Use Permit: 89-020
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: Sikand Engineering, Planning, Surveying Architecture: Dennis J. Flynn Landscape Architecture: The LA Group Inc.

Project Description:

These two housing series were approved in the same development application. Located adjacent to each other in the same housing tract, the Signature Series was marketed to first time home buyers with sales prices ranging from the high \$170,000s to the low \$200,000s; and the larger lot and house plan Estate Series was selling from the high \$250,000s to just below the \$300,000s. The tract is located on an upward rising hill south of Via Princesa in the Canyon Country area of eastern Santa Clarita in a growing area of many other residential tracts. To the east and

south is vacant urban reserve land and multi-family housing; to the north is more vacant land with both single- and multi-family residences; and to the west is multi-family housing. The Junior High School site occupies 17.2 of the 80 acres to the west of the tract. The Junior High School site was developed prior to the houses and is now complete and fully operating.

The site plan is comprised of a single loop road traveling through both housing series with cul-de-sacs branching off to both sides of the loop road. The Junior High School is accessed directly by the loop road to the east. The roads are extremely wide and have sidewalks to both sides. The houses are set back a minimum of 20' from the street and most have spacious front and back yards. The houses are minimally landscaped and no street trees are evident in the subdivision, but are required to be installed.

The houses are typical of non-descript suburban housing subdivisions in California. Garages dominate all of the front facades, with main entries tucked to the side and behind the garages. The houses are stucco-clad one and two story houses with concrete tiled, gable and hip roofs. Only the front elevation is detailed; the other three sides are left virtually barren of architectural detailing. Exterior front detailing includes brick and stone veneers, inoperable shutters, and decorative attic vents. The front elevations are outfitted with false divided light windows, with standard sliding windows and doors on the other 3 sides of each unit.

Planning and Development Issues:

No rezone was required for this project.

The placement of the school site within this project was a result of a land swap between the P & V Enterprises and William S. Hart Union High School Districts and in exchange for payment of school fees per unit. The provision and dedication of the school site within this project provided substantial pressure on the city to approve the project despite undesired extensive grading and slope adjustment required for the project. Because of these slopes a pump station was required to get water to many of the properties towards the higher elevations.

The project required extensive grading as 66% of the site had slopes of greater than 25%. Over 1.7 million cy of earth was moved during site grading (500,000 cy of grading for the school site itself). The maximum cut during grading was $\pm 80'$ (avg. cut of 40') and the maximum fill was $\pm 50'$ (avg. fill of 20'). Because of these relatively steep slopes the developer sought a conditional use permit to allow for a special density controlled development to provide lot size flexibility due to minimal buildable areas. The site was also partially located in the Hillside Management category which required special grading approvals. Although slope and ridgeline concerns were present in preparation of the project, the site was not located in any special earthquake, ecological or archaeological zones of Santa Clarita.

The developers were forced to halt construction due to market conditions and because of a proviso in the conditions of approval that mandated that Via Princessa had to be fully constructed and joined with Sierra Highway to the southeast of the project site before construction could begin, as Via Princessa is the primary access route to the tract.

Key Project Adjustments:

Many extra requirements were placed on this project as a result of the extensive grading and site development conditions. Additional slope analysis, geo-technical reports and ridgeline exhibits were required by the Planning and Engineering Department staffs. The developer was also required to form a Drainage Benefit Assessment District for continued maintenance of drainage improvements, and to pay for first year maintenance. Land for road improvements was purchased by the developer and dedicated to the city, road and signal improvements were required off-site, in addition to Bridge and Thoroughfare Benefit District fees for traffic mitigations. A Quimby fee of \$172,891 was required for local parks.

California Department Housing and Community Development

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

1986	William S. Hart Union HSD begins discussions with PV Enterprises to put together land swap and school land dedication deal;
25 Sept 89	Engineer's site development plan dated;
10 Oct 89	Owner's affidavit signed and submitted;
17 Oct 89	Application filed with Planning Department for tract and CUP with fee of \$6659;
6 Nov 89	Fire Department comments – standard;
8 Nov 89	So Cal Gas Co comments – service available;
14 Nov 89	Development Agreement signed by developer and William S. Hart Union HSD;
15 Nov 89	Santa Clarita Water Co comments – water service not available above elevation 156.5' above existing system – will require on-site pumping;
17 Nov 89	California Regional Water Quality Control Board comments – standard;
21 Nov 89	Sheriff's comments – none;
23 Nov 89	Development Review Committee meets and reviews project;
25 Jan 90	Initial Study Environmental Assessment prepared by Planning Department: brutally honest initial study with many potentially significant impacts noted; recommends Mitigated Negative Declaration due to extensive site preparation, grading, public service impacts, traffic, drainage, and natural resource loss;
29 Jan 90	Mitigated Negative Declaration Legal Notice prepared for project;
30 Jan 90	Public Hearing Notice for Planning Commission meeting of 20 Feb 90;
30 Jan 90	Revised Traffic Study by Crenshaw Traffic Engineering;
9 Feb 90	City Engineer memo to Planning Department – re: review of traffic study and concurrence with it;
20 Feb 90	Saugus Unified SD Attorney letter – re: mitigation agreement;
20 Feb 90	Staff Report to Planning Commission: recommended approval of neg. dec. with no significant findings, TT Map and CUP with conditions of approval;
undated	Eight letters of support from neighbors proctored by developer to Planning Commission;
20 Feb 90	Planning Commission Meeting: adopted several resolutions approving project; 85 conditions of approval adopted, mostly standard conditions; all road improvements, development standards and fees are detailed therein;
21 Feb 90	Notice of Determination: Mitigated Negative Declaration;
26 Feb 90	Article in the <i>Daily News</i> : "Hart District Pulling Deal Together – Land Trade with Developer Means Santa Clarita Could Have a 4 th Junior High;" details agreement for land swap; other property located southwest of Soledad Canyon and Sierra Highway; school official describes the "agony (it took) putting deal together;"
6 Mar 90	Acceptance form notarized and signed by developers/owners, re: conditions of approval;
19 Feb 91	Conditional Use Permit Application modification submitted;
20 Feb 91	Owner's affidavit signed by PV Enterprises and Friendly Valley Equestrian;
20 Feb 91	Financial Interest Disclosure Statement signed;
18 Feb 91	Public Hearing Notice sent to residents within 500';
27 Feb 91	Development Agreement signed by city and William S. Hart Union HSD;
7 Nov 91	Development Agreement signed and dated: Instrument 91-1787899 LA County;
12 Nov 91	Development Agreement recorded;
16 Nov 95	Phasing Map submitted to Planning Department; this phasing map called for 8 construction phases which is not in accord with the final phased construction—where the Signature Series alone accounted for 7 distinct phases including the models;
8 Jan 96	Planning Department letter to developer – re: road easements and debris basin required;
12 Jan 96	Western Pacific Housing assigned option partnership from PV Enterprises;
25 Mar 96	City Engineer letter to Western Pacific Housing – re: request for 2/3 proportional share of traffic signal; letter also sent to William S. Hart Union HSD for 1/3 proportional share;
3 Apr 96	Western Pacific Housing pays 2/3 share of traffic signal cost @ \$93,000;
25 Apr 96	Building Permit application for models;

California Department Housing and Community Development

28 Aug 96 **Building Permit issued for models;**
10 Jan 97 **Building Permit finalized for models;**
Aug 98 approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of the units are constructed and occupied.

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City:	17 Oct 1989 - 20 Feb 1990 = 4 months
Project put on hold:	late 1991 - late 1995
Building Permit Approval Models:	25 Apr 1996 - 28 Aug 1996 = 4 months
Building Construction Period Models:	28 Aug 1996 - 10 Jan 1997 = 4.5 months
Building Construction Continues:	10 Jan 1997 - Aug 98

Public Participation / Opposition:

There was very little public opposition by individuals or community groups to the project. The developer prepared a 38 page information fact sheet for neighbors in the area to seek support for the project prior to the approvals process. Meetings were also held with local Home Owners' Associations prior to project approval and during the construction process. The developer also contacted local residents to submit letters of support for the project on standardized support letter forms.

CITY OF SIMI VALLEY:
Silverthorne: single-family subdivision

Project Name:	Silverthorne at Indian Hills
Project Location:	north of Yosemite Drive and the 118 Freeway in northeast Simi Valley
Developer:	Long Beach Equities (land developer) 9301 Wilshire Boulevard Ste. 100, Beverly Hills California 90210 310 274 1204 Centex Homes (home builder) 5334 Moonshadows Street, Simi Valley California 93063 805 522 0531 (sales office address and phone no.)
Owner:	Simi Associates LP / Long Beach Equities 2901 Ocean Park Boulevard Ste. 205, Santa Monica California 90405 310 396 5559
Project Components:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-250 units proposed on 194 = 1.29 unit / acre, including 12 lettered lots for fuel modification, open space and detention areas;-residential lots occupy approx. 3/5 of the site; lettered lots = 2/5-550 units allowed, but only 250 proposed-207 standard home sites + 43 larger equestrian lots-two phase development; ea w/ various internal construction phases-no common recreation facilities-this case study = 121 lots on western half of development-102 medium density lots + 19 low density lots (to north)-13 construction phases, including a model phase; in 2 house series <p>-Slate Series:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Plan 1: 4 bdrm / 2.5 ba, 1 story, 2 car garage @ 2646 sf ea; with entry courtyard; optional 3 car garage and den; from \$350,000-Plan 2: 5 bdrm / 3 ba, 2 stories, 3 car garage @ 2922 sf with optional loft; from \$370,000-Plan 3: 5 bdrm / 4 ba, 2 stories, 3+car garage @ 3178 sf -3392 sf with optional den, library, bdrm 6, ba 5, or 4 car garage from \$383,000 <p>-Granite Series:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-Plan 4: 4 bdrm / 3.5 ba, 1 story, 3 car garage @ 3406 sf - 3573 sf with entry and interior courtyard; optional bdrm 5, 6, and ba from \$398,000-Plan 5: 5 bdrm / 4.5 ba, 2 stories, 4 car garage @ 3582 sf-3860 sf with optional super family rm, office, and bdrm; from \$410,000-Plan 6: 5 bdrm / 4 ba, 2 stories, 3+ car garage @ 9852 sf-4553 sf with optional office, bdrm, ba, bonus rm & porte cochere: from \$423,000

California Department Housing and Community Development

Project Numbers:

APNs: 620-070-055, -115
Tentative Tract Map: 4998
Planned Development Subdivision: PD-S-854
City of Simi Valley Annexation: CSV-66
Zone Change: Z-S-472 (pre-zoning)

Project Consultants:

Civil Engineering: Pace Engineering
Architecture: jbz Architecture and Planning
Landscape Architecture: Ivy Landscape Architecture

Project Description:

This upscale housing tract is located in the Santa Susana Mountains in eastern Simi Valley north of the Ronald Reagan 118 Freeway. The project site was initially Ventura County land before it was annexed to Simi Valley in the early 1990s. The site is a long irregular rectangle extending east to west in what was previously known as Marr Ranch near the Tapo Canyon area.

The subdivision is located off Yosemite Drive, which crosses the 118 freeway and curves to the west, one mile north of it. To the north of the project site is vacant hillside land with a few dirt tracks, grasses and oaks; to the south are single family subdivisions and Yosemite Drive; to the west are other single family subdivisions and the Simi Hills Golf Course; and to the east are Flanagan Drive and more vacant land. Yosemite Drive enters the project site diagonally at the south, cuts off the southwest corner of the site and exits diagonally at the northern boundary. Flanagan Drive snakes through the northern part of the site connecting to Yosemite Drive on the west and exiting the property at the eastern project boundary. This road connects the two phases of the project: Phase I on the west with 121 residential lots (this case study) and 129 residential lots on the east (a future tract). At the center of the tract separating the two residential phases is a large hill and open space area that leaves only enough room for Flanagan Drive to squeeze through, up against the northern boundary. The eastern tract is formed by the curving Flanagan Drive through the middle, with small cul-de-sacs to the north and south. Crazy Horse Drive branches off Flanagan Drive to the south and provides vehicular access to the Indian Hills Estates subdivision to the south of the project site.

The western phase I of Silverthorne has two general lot sizes. 19 larger sized lots are located in a row to the north of Flanagan Drive. The rest of the smaller medium-density lots are located to the south of Flanagan Drive, with 10 of the 102 mid-sized lots across Yosemite Drive to the south. The Phase I tract is comprised of an internal loop road south of Flanagan Drive and connecting to Yosemite Drive, with only a few short cul-de-sacs branching off it.

12 open space lots of various sizes are located primarily at the periphery of the project site, with the largest area located at the center (as mentioned above). The largest periphery open space lots are sited at the southwestern boundaries and the northeast corner. The open space lots have buffer zones for fuel modification at their edges, where they are adjacent to housing areas. The site is extremely hilly and most lots have unbuildable slopes in their backyards. A detention basin for runoff has been located to the southwest corner of the site just south of Yosemite Drive and the 10 residential lots. A dirt trail is located north of the lots near the northern boundary, which allows hikers access to the vacant lands north of the project. All of the open space lots are to retain their natural vegetation, except in the fuel modification easements. Steeper slopes in backyards and along street edges are intended to be hydro-seeded to inhibit landslides during wet weather. The city has required the formation of a Home Owner's Association for maintenance of these open spaces and all sloped areas.

The lots at cul-de-sac ends and at the perimeter of the tract are much larger than the interior lots and have substantial backyards. Although all of the lots are substantial, the interior lots have considerably smaller backyards due to the slopes. Simi Valley requires fawn-colored slump-block walls throughout the city, both between lots and around residential projects. There is full curbside parking throughout the development. There are no common recreational facilities intended in either phase of the development.

The phase I houses are designed in three traditional styles: Mediterranean, European Village, and American Vernacular. Each of the six models has 3 elevation options for the buyer reflecting these styles—although they are all colored similarly in earth-tones. The front elevations are dominated by garages on all of the options—however, these have been tempered somewhat by the use of multiple garage doors and placement beyond other architectural elements on some models. The front facades are heavily detailed, although the other 3 sides of each unit are relatively unadorned. The front elevations are finished with stucco plaster or horizontal wood siding on the walls, various styles of roof tiles, extensive door and window trim, inoperable shutters, painted wood fascias, balconies, decorative wood elements and railings, and decorative feature windows. The predominantly gable roofed buildings have many pop out elements on the front elevations to create visual interest and curb appeal. Additional curbside interest is created by the use of entry courtyards, covered walkways, portes cocheres, fountains, and masonry veneers.

Some of the options available on the units add substantial costs to the building. Some of these options include additional rooms, garages, libraries, offices, portes cocheres, balconies, and other large additions. The finish and interior amenity options are notable in this upscale subdivision: marble mosaic entry flooring, built-in entertainment center cabinets, granite countertops, marble bathrooms, upgraded Viking appliances and lighting, coffee bars in master bedroom suites, sound systems, arched doors and windows, and additional fireplaces. Some of the models come with optional exterior courtyard fireplaces and tiled patios. Buyers have the option to buy houses with upgraded landscaping, swimming pools, and/or fully furnished.

Planning and Development Issues:

The location of the project site outside the city boundary required an annexation to the City of Simi Valley from Ventura County. The project site originally fell under the jurisdiction of a specific plan for the area, which was discarded through a General Plan Amendment prior to the application of the project. A development agreement was approved at the time of the General Plan Amendment. The development required several different project specific approvals, including: the perfunctory Tentative Tract Map approval, along with a zone change from a vacant--urban reserve designation to residential low-density, residential medium-density and open space designations and a Planned Development approval. The entitlements process included approvals from a Development Advisory Committee, the Planning Commission and the City Council.

The developers took advantage of a voluntary pre-application review (with fee) offered by the Department of Environmental Services / Planning. This enabled the developers to receive comments from relevant agencies and service providers to assess the costs, scheduling, and design of the project. The Development Advisory Committee completed this preliminary review and outlined to the developer the approvals process for the project.

The site is hilly and was originally covered with grasses and mature oak trees, a ranch house and a few out-buildings. Demolitions were required for these buildings and trees that were located on the site. 17 mature oaks and 1 mature arroyo willow were destroyed in the process of grading and site improvements. The City Council was required to provide a Statement of Overriding Consideration for the demolition of the trees. Open space areas were retained in their natural state but required fuel modification at all edges to prevent the spread of grass fires to the residential areas.

The project site is located on several hills and is sloping throughout the site. Substantial grading was required to prepare the site for construction. Drainage slopes and building pads had to be created for house construction; street and cul-de-sac elevations required extensive earth moving. An on site retention basin for runoff was required and is located in the southwest corner of the development.

The city sole-sourced an environmental consultant to complete environmental assessment for the project. A project specific EIR was completed for this project. The EIR was completed and certified by the City Council, along with a Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.

California Department Housing and Community Development

The little neighborhood opposition that existed on the project was concerned with cumulative impacts of urbanization and the connection of the project to the existing neighborhood south of the project. Each side of the development required two entrances for emergency access purposes. While the western project entries are located at Yosemite Drive from the south and Flanagan Drive from the east, the east side of the development (Phase II) only had access from Flanagan Drive through the Phase I western half through the entire eastern half of the subdivision to the eastern boundary. A second vehicular entry point to the south was required for emergency access to the eastern half of the subdivision. Residents of the Indian Hills Estates to the south of the project site opposed the extension of Crazy Horse Drive into the project site, as a large percentage of traffic to this eastern half of the development would be required to drive through the earlier subdivision from the south.

Key Project Adjustments:

Comments from relevant service providers and agencies were generally of a standard nature, but were very extensive. Additional project site reporting was mandated on a variety of environmental topics. Various impact and assessment district fees were required by a variety of agencies, including Recreation and Parks fees @ \$2633 per lot. Many physical additions and changes were made to the project through agency comment, including: construction of a park trail through open space lots E and L; the dedication of several open space lots to the Recreation and Parks District; the creation of fuel modification zones for fire protection at the edges of most open space lots; if open space areas are dedicated to the city—required fencing of all fuel modification zones; additional park fees if open space land is not dedicated; \$150,000 into Flanagan Drive Trust for street improvements; improvements to several off-site access streets; sound walls and all fencing throughout the project to be constructed of slumpstone; all meters to be screened; all roofing to be tile—asphalt shingles prohibited; mandated that 75% of houses have more than 3 bedrooms; required bay, greenhouse, or stained glass windows in units; required more varied front yard setbacks; required special concrete finishes and treatments for unit driveways; required a Home Owner's Association; required recreational vehicle parking spaces to be screened; required full irrigation, landscaping, and xeriscape planting.

In addition to physical changes and adjustments, the city also required excessive reporting on the site and the environment. Many cultural resources, soils, geotechnical, seismic, liquefaction, traffic, engineering, hydrology, tree, and impact studies were required by various city agencies throughout the approval process. Some of these reports and studies were required through EIR production; others through discretionary request of specific agencies.

No change in the unit count was noted in the project file through the course of the approvals process.

The house plans and elevations provided by Long Beach Equities during the entitlements process were discarded once Centex Homes was assigned the development of the first phase. While the style and scale of the houses remains of a similar nature to those approved, significant changes are evident in the designs.

Sales price information on those few units that have been sold thus far, indicate that the asking price for the lots and houses has risen dramatically since the first units were put on the market.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

July 80	Cultural Resources Inventory of 800 acres of Marr Ranch;
Oct 80	Additional Cultural Resources Inventory of 131 acres of Marr Ranch;
3 July 80	Geologic-Soils Report for Marr Ranch;
Feb 83	Final EIR for annexation of part of Marr Ranch;
25 July 83	Tree Evaluation;
4 Dec 84	Soils Engineering Report for Parcel A;
July 85	Archaeological Surface Reconnaissance of Marr Ranch;
July 85	Archaeological Test Investigations on Marr Ranch;

California Department Housing and Community Development

7 Aug 85	Hydrology Report by Pace Engineering;
Aug 85	Marr Ranch Fault Study by Buena Engineering;
Jan 86	Cultural Resources Marr Ranch Specific Plan;
Jan 86	Draft EIR SP-5-10;
16 Sept 88	Neighborhood Council Development Review meeting: project denied; 1200 units proposed 1988;
1 June 89	Geologic and Soils Engineering Report for TT 4497;
24 June 91	Feasibility Study for Groundwater Extraction on Marr Ranch;
5 Nov 1993	Development Agreement DA 93-01 prepared for Marr Ranch development; Development Agreement expires on 5 Nov 96;
15 Dec 93	Topographical site map submitted by Engineer;
1994	General Plan Amendment prepared to remove special plan Designation approved by Neighborhood Council Development Review;
14 Oct 94	City Council meeting: approval of DA 93-1; minimal findings noted;
19 Oct 94	Planning Commission meeting to discuss DA 93-1;
21 Nov 94	City Council passes ordinance approving General Plan Amendment for project, Development Agreement, addendum to Preliminary Final EIR prepared for previous project;
Jan 95	Staff begins discussions with Applicant about the current proposal;
22 Feb 95	Police memo to Department of Environmental Services / Planning – re: the project will required the addition of another officer to the force;
13 Mar 95	Chicago Title Co. Title Report;
15 Mar 95	Revision by Engineer to Tentative Tract Map;
21 Mar 95	Recreation and Parks District letter to Department of Environmental Services / Planning – re: draft conditions of approval submitted;
28 Mar 95	Preliminary Review Application submitted;
11 Apr 95	Public Works Preliminary Review project check list and comments submitted;
11 Apr 95	Development Advisory Committee preliminary review meeting: project discussed and comments collected;
13 Apr 95	Recreation and Park District comments; they want all open space lots dedicated to city; Applicant does not want to dedicate these lands to the city;
16 May 95	Preliminary Review of project (PR 395); comments made by various agencies are forwarded to the Applicant by Department of Environmental Services / Planning;
25 May 95	Department of Environmental Services / Planning letter to Applicant – re: LAFCO and annexation issues;
16 June 95	Application submitted for Tentative Tract, Planned Development, Variance and Zone Change;
25 June 95	Calleguas Municipal Water District comments: project shall comply with Capital Construction Charges;
28 June 95	Police Department comments;
6 July 95	Recreation and Park District comments; project presented to Board; drainage and mitigation alternatives discussed;
3 July 95	Fire Department conditions of approval submitted;
5 July 95	Development Advisory Committee meeting; alignments of Flanagan and Yosemite Drives reviewed along with many other issues; project continued to next meeting;
6 July 95	Public Works Engineering comments: project application incomplete; draft conditions of approval submitted;
6 July 95	Simi Valley Sanitation District comments: standard;
12 July 95	Santa Monica Mountain Conservancy letter to Department. Of Environmental Services/Planning – re: habitat integrity and trail easements queried;
13 July 95	Traffic Study by RKJK;

California Department Housing and Community Development

14 July 95	Sewer Study by Pace Engineering;
20 July 95	Department. Of Environmental Services / Planning comments: project application incomplete;
24 July 95	Ventura County Public Works Department and Flood Control District comments;
25 July 95	Oak Tree Study by Tom Olsen;
9 Aug 95	Biological and Wetlands Study by Tom Olsen;
15 Aug 95	Geologic-Soils Report updated;
1 Sept 95	Civil Engineering Technical Water Impact Study; no water storage deficiency on site;
18 Sept 95	Civil Engineering Technical Report by Pace Engineering;
18 Sept 95	Hydrology Report by Pace Engineering;
19 Sept 95	Applicant letter to Department of Environmental Services / Planning – re: Recreation and Park District Comments queried;
22 Sept 95	Exhibits submitted by Applicant for Development Advisory Committee review;
22 Sept 95	Project routed to agencies for comment for Development Advisory Committee review;
3 Oct 95	Initial Environmental Planning Study – Liquefaction Potential Report; more seismic study is warranted; additional information is required;
9 Oct 95	Fire Department comments: standard;
10 Oct 95	Recreation and Park District comments; conditions of approval to be resubmitted to Board for further consideration;
10 Oct 95	Development Advisory Committee meeting: project incomplete;
11 Oct 95	Public Works comments: application still incomplete;
20 Oct 95	Recreation and Parks District letter to Department of Environmental Services / Planning – re: disagreement with Applicant over intentions for property;
2 Nov 95	Recreation and Park District comments and conditions of approval submitted;
30 Nov 95	Revised exhibits submitted;
18 Dec 95	Police Department comments;
19 Dec 95	Public Works Transportation comments – application incomplete; liquefaction responses inadequate; other comments included;
19 Dec 95	Development Advisory Committee meeting: project reviewed; still incomplete application;
21 Dec 95	GeoSoils Inc Report – response to liquefaction potential report of 3 Oct 95;
8 Jan 96	Traffic Engineer comments on traffic study: no significant impacts noted despite trip projection;
25 Jan 96	Revised agreement between city and Applicant for EIR; costs of EIR = \$55,365 with an additional processing fee of \$16,610 to the city;
6 Mar 96	Revised exhibits submitted and project routed to agencies for Development Advisory Committee comments;
15 Mar 96	Development Advisory Committee meeting: application still incomplete;
19 Mar 96	Applicant letter to City Manager – re: scheduling and processing of EIR;
25 Mar 96	Police Department comments;
27 Mar 96	Department of Environmental Services / Planning letter to Applicant – re: sole sourced contract granted to Robert Bein, William Frost Associates for EIR on parcel A of Marr Ranch (249.6 acres);
29 Mar 96	\$7389 fee paid to Department of Environmental Services / Planning;
5 Apr 96	Department of Environmental Services / Planning memo to City Manager – re: request for sole sourcing of EIR consultant; normal EIR process in Simi Valley takes one year;
12 Apr 96	Initial Study completed: Notice of preparation of EIR and Initial Study sent to State Clearinghouse;
15 Apr 96	30 day Notice of Preparation of EIR begins;
24 Apr 96	Revised proposal from Robert Bein, William Frost Associates for EIR;
24 Apr 96	Recreation and Parks District comments: application now deemed complete; cash in-lieu of 4.6 acre parkland dedication is acceptable; final conditions of approval submitted; conditions require the dedication of open space lots B and L to city for trail construction; developer required to construct trails across open space lots;
29 Apr 96	Public Works Engineer comments: application now complete;
30 Apr 96	Department of Environmental Services / Planning memo to various agencies – re: sole sourcing of EIR consultant and review of EIR contract;

California Department Housing and Community Development

8 May 96	Police Department comments;
9 May 96	Ventura County Public Works Department and Flood Control District comments;
15 May 96	Notice of Preparation of EIR: comment period ends;
21 May 96	Neighborhood Council Development Review check list;
30 May 96	Department of Environmental Services / Planning deems application complete;
20 June 96	Applicant submits project exhibits for review;
11 July 96	Neighborhood Advisory Council No. 3 meeting: tree preservation concerns; passes council vote 7-6-0; but fails to pass audience vote 2-4-0;
16 July 96	Project routed to agencies for comment; comments due back to Department of Environmental Services / Planning by 30 July 96;
16 July 96	Neighborhood Advisory Council No. 4 meeting: connection of Flanagan Drive and Yosemite Drive opposed by residents; Home Owners Association required to maintain open space; passes council vote 7-0-0 but fails audience vote 2-27-0;
29 July 96	Public notification of EIR availability for public review;
29 July 96	EIR routed to agencies and public for comment;
30 July 96	Transit agency comments: none;
1 Aug 96	Recreation and Parks District letter to Planning Commission – re: occupant increase to parks calculated at 808 new residents; they require 4.03 acres of parkland dedication;
8 Aug 96	Ventura County Flood Control District comments; same as previous;
13 Aug 96	Department of Environmental Services / Planning letter to Applicant – re: annexation of property prepared by city;
26 Aug 96	Public Works memo – re: comments on the Draft EIR for Marr Ranch; EIR doesn't adequately address certain issues, including: cumulative impacts and roads; per trip fee of \$111.82 x 2380 trips = \$266,131.60 for project;
11 Sept 96	EIR comment period closes;
16 Sept 96	Police Department comments: minor with conditions of approval attached;
25 Sept 96	Department of Environmental Services / Planning comments and conditions of approval; Home Owners Association, dedication of streets to city, and off-site street improvements required;
9 Oct 96	Police Department comments;
undated	Notice of Public Hearing for Planning Commission meeting of 23 Oct 96;
11 Oct 96	Department of Environmental Services / Planning letter to Public Works, City, and Transportation Department – re: responses to their various comments;
11 Oct 96	Draft Staff Report to Planning Commission sent to Applicant; 52 pages of extensive findings included in report;
11 Oct 96	Application amended to dedicate APN: 620-070-055 as permanent open space;
21 Oct 96	Recreation and Parks District meeting with Applicant to discuss open space lots and dedications to city; Applicant opposes these dedications;
22 Oct 96	Recreation and Parks District letter to Department of Environmental Services / Planning – re: cash in-lieu accepted; revised conditions presented; some conditions removed due to agreement with developer;
23 Oct 96	Planning Commission meeting: approved project through several resolutions;
1 Nov 96	City Manager Mike Sedell appealed all Planning Commission approvals for project: to allow City Council full discretion over the project, due to the magnitude of the issues, e.g., annexations, zone changes, and EIR certification--in order to allow Planned Development and Tentative Tract map to be consistent with the zone change;
5 Nov 96	90 day extension granted for Development Agreement 93-01; extended to 10 Feb 97;
20 Nov 96	Letter of Opposition from Citizens for a Safe and Scenic Simi Valley; opposed to urbanization;
21 Nov 96	Staff Report and Supplemental Report to Council;
25 Nov 96	Applicant's Attorney letter to Council – re: support for Planning Commission decisions;
25 Nov 96	City Council meeting: project discussed but returned back to the Applicant and Staff for further work; required preservation of mature oak trees; Flanagan Drive improvements required; council wants to see alternatives to deal with 20% slope encroachment; Home Owners

California Department Housing and Community Development

Association required to manage slopes, fuel modification and detention basin areas; findings included in minutes; boundary adjustment to Marr Ranch approved in Resolution 96-108

14 Dec 96 Ventura County Fire Department comments: project application complete; ‘

16 Dec 96 Staff Report to Council: report details significant opposition by CSSSV to the extension of Crazy Horse Drive to Yosemite Drive; they also want Hillside Development Standards upheld;

16 Dec 96 City Council meeting: continued hearing to certify EIR; some project approvals completed; council approves Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring Plan for project; mature trees on project site allowed to be demolished in statement of overriding considerations; EIR certified through Resolution 96-120; approved Tentative Tract Map and all conditions of approval through Resolution 96-121; Ordinance introduced and pre-zoning approved for zone change in Resolution 96-122; 33 pages of extensive conditions of approval, including specifications of major building materials and finishes;

6 Jan 97 City Council meeting: approval of zone change and all other remaining entitlements;

3 Oct 97 Building Permit application submitted; request for pre-mastered approval for all units;

16 Dec 97 Building Permits issued for models;

22 June 98 Building Permits finalized for models;

Aug 98 Construction continues on units.

Total Time for Approvals:

Earlier Studies, Reports & Proposals:	1980 - 1993 = 13 years
Development. Agreement / GP Amendment:	5 Nov 1993 - 21 Nov 1994 = 12.5 months
Preliminary Review by City:	28 Mar 1995 - 16 May 1995 = 1.5 months
Project Deemed Complete:	16 June 1995 - 30 May 1996 = 11.5 months
Project Approval by City:	30 May 1996 - 6 Jan 1997 = 7 months
Building Permit Approval for models:	3 Oct 1997 - 16 Dec 1997 = 2.5 months
Building Construction Period for models:	16 Dec 1997 - 22 June 1998 = 6.25 months
Building Construction Period:	22 June 1998 - Aug 98, continuing

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received little opposition from neighbors and other groups. Citizens for a Safe and Scenic Simi Valley opposed the current project. They were concerned about creeping urbanization, oak tree preservation, hillside retention, traffic on local streets and congestion in the city. Other Neighborhood Advisory Councils also had concern about traffic through their tracts. Prior project proposals had similar opposition from Neighborhood Advisory Councils, which resulted in earlier project denials.

Although Planning Commission approval of this project was appealed to the City Council, this seems to have been due to procedural issues brought up by the City Manager's office, rather than any direct opposition to the project itself. The City Manager was concerned about the Planning Commission giving permission for a project requiring policy discretion, that was not legally zoned for a specific use yet. The City Manager preferred that the City Council provide the legal basis for the project prior to any permits or development approvals. The City Council through the appeal process was thus given full discretionary review over the project., especially related to policy discretion on proposed improvements in slope areas of 20% or greater, preservation of oak trees, drainage facilities, maintenance of landscaping, fuel modification zones, open space areas, and connections to local streets. This appeal did not significantly extend the entitlement period for the project, as the City Council had to approve the zone change anyway.

CITY of SANTA ROSA:
Evelyn's Ranch: single-family subdivision

<i>Project Name:</i>	Evelyn's Ranch
<i>Project Location:</i>	2830 Stony Point Road, near the intersection of Yuba Road in southwest Santa Rosa
<i>Developer:</i>	SUI Corporation 987 Airway Court, Santa Rosa California 95403 707 571 7659 Brookfield Homes 5960 Inglewood Drive, No. 200, Pleasanton California 94588 925 463 2600
<i>Owner:</i>	Evelyn Wismer 2830 Stony Point Road, Santa Rosa California 95407 707 523 2893
<i>Project Components:</i>	-154 residential units on 19.7 acres = 7.82 units per acre -min. lot = 3080 sf - max. lot = 5200 sf: avg. lot size = 3900 sf -seven different house types and sizes throughout development -houses range from 900 sf to 2000 sf -mixture of 1 and 2 story units -all with 2 car garages, driveways, front- and -backyards; -streetside parking throughout the development -308 covered parking + 308 uncovered parking + 175 curbside -no community amenities or recreation centers on site
<i>Project Numbers:</i>	APN: 134-042-046 / 88-03248 File No. 95-0352-01 Tentative Map Development Plan
<i>Project Consultants:</i>	Civil Engineering: T.D.G. Consulting Civil Engineers, Inc. Architecture: Farrell - Faber & Associates Landscape Architecture: Lufkin Landscape Architecture

Project Description:

Evelyn's Ranch is located in an urbanizing area of southwest Santa Rosa. To the north of the project site is another single-family subdivision (Bellevue Ranch), which is intended for future housing and commercial development; to the south is a rural residential parcel; to the west are Stony Point Road, county land, and rural residential properties; and to the east is Elsie Allen High School. The city is annexing these properties from the county as development proposals are submitted. At the time of this application submittal, the project site only had derelict agricultural buildings, an old farm house and a hayfield located there. Situated on flat agricultural land, the site also had minimal seasonal wetlands that were delineated by the US Army Corps of Engineers.

Along Stony Point Road, a large landscaped setback (lot A) was required by the city. The primary entrances to the site are from the north from the adjacent subdivision and from Yuba Drive off Stony Point Road. The northern

subdivision had left stub streets leading to the Evelyn's Ranch property for its development. The Southwest Santa Rosa area plan has strict design guidelines for site plan development, and does not allow cul-de-sacs. All of the roads in the site plan are loop roads with knuckles provided at interior corners. Liscum Street bisects the site in half from the north, and a stub road has been left to access future site development to the south. Yuba Drive skirts the northernmost boundary of the site until it links up with Liscum Street. A primary loop road on the western side of the development is connected to both Liscum Street and Yuba Drive. A second road from the adjacent northern subdivision (Red Tail Street) enters the site to the east of Liscum Street at the northern boundary and serves the eastern half of the subdivision. A single loop road and an east-west street bisecting through this loop are located to the east of Red Tail Street.

The lots are sized according to Santa Rosa's Housing Allocation System. On the west and south sides of the project are the smaller Reserve A and to the east are the larger Reserve B lots. Flag lots have been used at the corners in addition to a shared driveway (Lot B) in the northwest corner. Seven house plans with two elevations each are scattered across the tract. At corner sites, duplex units that turn the corner have been provided to give the subdivision more continuous street frontage elevations and avoid unappealing side yards and fencing. The subdivision promotes the pedestrian experience in its design by indenting curbside parking mid-block, providing landscaped parking strips, mandating extensive street and accent tree planting, and providing continuous building frontages at the side block elevations.

The houses are finished with horizontal hardboard wood siding, asphalt composition shingles, and muntin single-hung and sliding windows. All the units have deep functional porches, and combination gable-end and hip roofs. The houses have minimal detailing on their front elevations, that includes decorative wood railings and columns at their porches and painted wood fascias. The streetside elevations of the houses include many pop-outs and volumetric elements. However, the other three sides of the house are much simpler and austere. Although the project has utilized new urbanist principles in part, the units are still dominated by large roll-up garage doors on their front elevations.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project is located in an area of southwest Santa Rosa that is slowly being annexed to the city in piece-meal fashion. This site was annexed to the city on 28 Aug 1995 and rezoned per the Evelyn's Ranch project as a Planned Community (PC). No rezoning was required for the project. Density allowances for the site permit 2-8 dwelling units per acre. Prior to development the site was used as a hayfield and a dairy ranch. Several buildings required demolition, including an old farm house, barns and sheds. An Historic Structure Report was required prior to demolition of the farm house.

Although no flood hazard jeopardizes the site, the US Army Corps of Engineers delineated minor seasonal wetlands on the site, which the developer intended to fill. The developer received a USACE permit for 4.5 acres of fill on the site that would eliminate the seasonal wetland.

Pedestrian access to the site and the adjacent high school site were required during the entitlements process. This required a minor redesign to allow a public pedestrian pathway between two lots on the eastern block of the site.

The area plan EIR included a statement of overriding consideration with respect to development in the area given the inadequacy of US-101 through the city. The highway only accommodates 2 lanes in each direction, and the congestion at peak hour times is very heavy. However, US-101 is the primary access road to the project site. The Planning Commission debated putting a hold on the development until 101 had been upgraded, but this was later rejected.

The city of Santa Rosa has adopted a Growth Management Plan and a Housing Allocation Plan that ensures a variety of housing types and sizes, and places quotas on various lot sizes on an annual basis. The smaller Reserve A lots and the larger Reserve B lots each have a quota of 500 units per year. Reserve B units are also required to pay a \$2600 per unit development impact in-lieu fee to promote affordable housing. As a result of this growth

California Department Housing and Community Development

management plan, the construction schedule for this project will be stretched out over three years, and the lots phased in accordance with their annual lot allocation. This system adds both time and cost to projects, but rationalizes urbanization within the city.

The city has also adopted design guidelines for small lot subdivisions such as this one. These guidelines are upheld by the Design Review Board when each project is reviewed. The following criteria are used by the Design Review Board in assessing projects: 1. Lotting patterns that encourage a variety of lot sizes and configurations to reduce monotony and avoid garage door dominance; 2. Building placement that takes advantage of natural factors; 3. Building design that ensures adequate privacy and places garage frontages beyond other building elements; 4. Projects that are composed of both one and two story buildings with various second story setbacks; 5. Projects with second units or carriage houses are encouraged; 6. The use of alleys for garages and utility servicing; 7. A mix of straight and curvilinear streets, the use of shared driveways between lots, planting strips at sidewalks, reduced street widths; and 8. Landscaping that maintains a strong design theme and is scaled appropriately. The city recommends that at least some of these elements, not necessarily all of them, be in place prior to project review. Since the developer and architect understood these guidelines, the project included them from the beginning.

Key Project Adjustments:

The city required improvements to Stony Point Road. These included installation of a water main, road improvements, sound walls, berms, and landscaping of Lot A.

Comments from relevant service providers and agencies were generally of a standard nature. Few changes were requested to the project during the entitlements process from these agencies. The Design Review Board requested several changes however, including: street width reductions, the addition of front porches, fencing, decorative paving of driveways in a variety of materials, and the elimination of cul-de-sacs.

A change in the unit count was noted in the project file through the course of the approvals process. The initial application requested 151 units. The project was later approved for 154 units. Although the unit count has been maintained at 154 units subsequent to receiving entitlements, the phasing of Reserve A and B units and their construction schedule has fluctuated widely over the last 2 years.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

24 Mar 94	Traffic Study by LSA Associates: recommends phasing of the improvements along Stony Point Road and Hearn Avenue;
6 June 94	Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan adopted; Land Use proposal No. 16 for the Evelyn's Ranch site discussed and pre-zoned;
26 Oct 94	EIP Associates letter to USACE – re: discussion of wetlands on .1 acres of the site;
21 Jan 95	EIP Associates letter to Applicant – re: no wetlands or vernal pools on the site;
28 Aug 95	Project site annexed to the city of Santa Rosa;
3 Oct 95	Design Review Board Application submitted;
19 Oct 95	Design Review Board meeting: several design changes requested, including: reduced street widths; no cul-de-sacs allowed; interlinked loop streets required; project must be consistent with existing adjacent developments; front porches required;
6 Nov 95	Subdivision Tentative Map submittal information attachment;
9 Nov 95	Application submitted for Tentative Tract Map; several fees collected, including: application fee of \$4725; public hearing fee of \$100; environmental review fee of \$125; and SW Area Plan recovery fee of \$729;
9 Nov 95	Growth Management Housing Allocation Application: 31 small Reserve A units requested for 1996, 60 larger Reserve B units requested for 1996, and 60 larger Reserve B units requested for 1997;

California Department Housing and Community Development

9 Nov 95 **Environmental Assessment Application submitted;**

16 Nov 95 Design Review Board meeting: changes required to building elevations; Board in favor of project but still has concerns with regard to specific lots that back on to Stony Point Road;

16 Nov 95 **Application deemed complete; letter of notification sent to Applicant;**

24 Nov 95 Public Neighborhood Meeting with Applicant and Planning Staff – only two residents showed up to voice concerns;

28 Nov 95 Project routed to agencies for comment; comments due back by 12 Dec 95;

4 Dec 95 Bellevue School District comments – supportive of project; independent mitigation agreement signed by Applicant and school district;

6 Dec 95 PG&E comments -- few; 7.5' utility easement required on lots beyond sidewalk;

11 Dec 95 Recreation and Parks Department comments -- few comments; they will choose major species of street trees and landscape material; request for Landscape Agreement for Stony Point Road landscape strip;

15 Dec 95 Utilities Department comments – extensive comments with regard to water and sewerage servicing with preliminary conditions of approval;

19 Dec 95 Engineering Division comments – requirement for public water main along Stony Point Road-- costs to be shared with another project adjacent to this one; phasing within project to be coordinated with utility servicing;

19 Dec 95 Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: comments thus far require: an historic structures report for demolition of an historic home; a wetland mitigation statement; and other comments to bring project in conformance with planning and zoning standards;

22 Jan 96 Historic Structure Report: turn of the century farm house in poor condition; little historical significance;

30 Jan 96 Plan's submitted to Planning Department;

31 Jan 96 Final Development Advisory Committee Report: shows 154 lots with one common landscape parcel along Stony Point Road and one common driveway parcel in the northwest corner; conditions of approval included herein; all easements and agreements delineated; report incorporates all agency comments; all utilities must be undergrounded; landscape irrigation required throughout project; various fees required, including Parks fees, landscape and maintenance fees for common landscape parcel; Environmental conditions of approval require the preparation of a wetlands mitigation and monitoring plan, a development permit from USACE, and a 1603 Streambed Alteration Agreement through the California Department of Fish and Game; Growth Allocation Management units are revised: 34 small Reserve A units requested for 1996, 75 larger Reserve B units requested for 1997, and 45 larger Reserve B units requested for 1998;

22 Feb 96 Initial Study completed; several potentially significant impacts noted, including: traffic increases, an additional demand for housing, noise, loss of agricultural land, drainage impacts; however no new impacts not previously addressed in Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan EIR were found;

22 Feb 96 **Planning Commission meeting: project approved through several resolutions;** staff finds project consistent with area plan; all issues have been addressed; Planning Commission questioned such extensive policies on urban design as outlined in the area plan; no public opposition or comment received; Planning Commission concerned about EIR conformance vis-a-vis the upgrade of US-101 prior to the approval of this project, as the highway is already over-capacity through Santa Rosa;

23 Feb 96 Letter Planning Department to Applicant – re: notification of Planning Commission decision; notification of Growth Management Plan housing allocation: 34 small Reserve A units requested for 1996, 44 larger Reserve B units requested for 1997, 75 larger Reserve B units requested for 1998, and 1 larger Reserve B unit for 1999;

23 Feb 96 Notice of Determination filed;

California Department Housing and Community Development

6 June 96	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: change in Growth Management Plan housing allocation: 31 small Reserve A units requested for 1997, 44 larger Reserve B units requested for 1997, 75 larger Reserve B units requested for 1998, 3 smaller Reserve A units for 1999, and 1 larger Reserve B unit for 1999;
4 Dec 96	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: parks fee will be collected at issuance of building permit;
28 Jan 97	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: change in Growth Management Plan housing allocation: 2 small Reserve A units requested for 1998, 73 larger Reserve B units requested for 1998, 30 smaller Reserve A units for 1999, 45 larger Reserve B units for 1999, and 4 larger Reserve B unit for 2000;
31 Jan 97	Planning Department letter to Applicant – re: Southwest Santa Rosa Area Plan fee credit and reimbursement for installation of water main along Stony Point Road;
1 May 98	Improvement Plans approved;
6 May 98	USACE letter – re: wetlands delineation finds 4.5 acres of seasonal wetlands to be filled by developer; mitigation and monitoring conditions included;
19 May 98	USACE signs wetlands mitigation and monitoring agreement;
25 May 98	One year extension granted for entitlements; set to expire in 1998;
26 May 98	Applicant signs wetlands mitigation and monitoring agreement;
June 98	Final Map recorded for first phase along eastern edge of parcel; the improvement plan however is approved all at one time—although construction is phased; single grading permit for the site; Improvement Agreement signed with the city;
Aug 98	Grading and Improvement phase in construction; No building permit or plan check application has been submitted at this time.

Total Time for Approvals:

Project Approval by City: 3 Oct 1995 - 22 Feb 1996 = 4.75 months

Public Participation / Opposition:

The project received little opposition from neighbors and other groups. Just a couple of neighbors voiced concern over the project at the Planning Commission meeting where the project was approved. The project file did not indicate what concerns these residents had with the project.

CITY OF STOCKTON:
Brookside Estates: single-family subdivision

Project Name: Brookside Estates, Unit No. 25

Project Location: South of Fourteen Mile Slough and North of Riverbrook Drive,
part of the Brookside Estates master-planned community in west-
central Stockton

Developer: Robert L. Ripken and Grupe Development Associates
P.O. Box 7576
Stockton, California 95267
(209) 473 6000

project sold to: Lewis Homes, Sacramento

Owner: Robert L. Ripken
6269 Crooked Stick Circle
Stockton California 95219
(209) 478 6409 or (209) 481 1298

Project Components: 130 lots on 22.32 acres = 5.8 units/acre
lot sizes 4275 sf - 6750 sf (typical)
3 house plans each with 3 elevations
house sizes range from 1139 sf - 1472 sf
1 and 2 stories @ max 26 ft high
3 and 4 bedroom house plans ea with 2 car garages

Project Numbers: EIR 2-88, TM 4-97, PURD 3-97

Project Description:

This housing subdivision is one phase of a larger 1312 acre master planned community in west Stockton. The larger Brookside Estates development is surrounded by slough or river to the north, south and west. It is a mixed use development of single- and multi-family residences with clustered commercial uses near the center. The larger development offers many upscale amenities for its residents, including: a golf course, a country club, recreation centers, public facilities, libraries and schools. All residents belong to the Brookside Estates Master Homeowners Association, and residents may purchase membership in the private country club, swim club or tennis center. The larger development is composed of discrete residential cul-de-sac subdivisions that are accessed predominantly by single vehicular entrances from collector roads. The entire area was annexed to the city of Stockton from unincorporated San Joaquin County in the late 1980s. A master EIR (EIR 2-88) by Jones and Stokes Associates covers all projected development within the project area. The draft EIR was presented in Sept 1988 and the final EIR was certified in early 1989. The Brookside Estates development is expected to have a 15-20 year build-out with an expected population of 9770 and an estimated employment base of 3145. The original land developer Grupe Development Associates typically sells subdivisions to other housing developers, rather than developing the houses themselves.

The Brookside Estates project Unit 25 is a middle-income housing project within a gated community of 130 lots. The project is to be developed in phases of 40-60 units each, until subdivision build-out. The community will be closed after sunset to both pedestrians and vehicles who must then be buzzed in from a single entrance gate. A loop road is the primary accessway within the subdivision, with two short cul-de-sacs to the interior of the loop

California Department Housing and Community Development

road. A pedestrian accessway between lots at the northern boundary allows pedestrians to access the slough and a bike path from the primary loop road within the subdivision. All roads and improvements within the subdivision are private and will be maintained by a homeowners association. Sidewalks are located only on one side of the street. The houses are intended to be traditional American homes. They have stucco and hard-board siding with masonry and wood detailing and concrete tile roofs. Two-car garages dominate the front elevations of the houses. However, since the project was sold, the new developer is anticipating changes in the house designs.

Planning and Development Issues:

The project was consistent with a previously approved EIR for the full Master Planned Community and was exempt from further environmental review. However it was subject to several sets of standards relating to the slough at the northern property boundary: US Army Corps of Engineers Standards, Brookside Estates Boat Dock Standards, and Stockton Levee Encroachment Standards. The project area has been re-evaluated by FEMA to remove the flood plain designation. The project required a Planned Unit Residential Permit (PURD), but did not require any rezoning as this project is a permitted use within its zone. The land was vacant at the time of approval.

Key Project Adjustments:

There is no Architectural / Design Review Board in Stockton, so only site review was undertaken by the planning department. Few changes were witnessed in this project, save for the inclusion of sidewalks on one side of each street, a masonry wall around the project, and the provision of pedestrian access to the slough.

Approval Chronology: (important approval dates in bold)

Sep 88	Draft EIR 2-88 for Brookside Estates submitted--master EIR for planned community;
Jan 89	Final EIR 2-88 for Brookside Estates completed by Jones and Stokes; certified;
25 Aug 91	Addendum to EIR 2-88 for Brookside Estates completed by Harry W. Montgomery;
12 Sep 91	Notice of Determination of no significant impacts for EIR amendment filed;
12 Sep 91	Planning Commission adopts Findings of Fact and Statement of Over-riding Considerations, along with Mitigation Monitoring Program for EIR and amendment;
29 Oct 91	City Council Resolution 91-0811 re-certifies EIR 2-88 and Resolution 91-0812 adopts rezonings within original PURD for full community; Ordinance 061-91 also approved which amends zoning map;
unknown date	Pre-application discussions with Planning Department begin;
11 July 96	Amendment to Settlement and Exchange Agreement of 23 April 1996 by City Council Resolution 96-0196: re, public access to slough;
14 Apr 97	Planning Application for PURD Permit and Tentative Map;
14 Apr 97	Disclosure of Campaign Contributions to Stockton Planning Commission Members signed by applicant: no contributions noted;
14 Apr 97	Tentative Subdivision Map Statement signed by applicant;
17 Apr 97	Routing and scheduling form for agency comments on PURD 3-97;
22 Apr 97	Referrals to agencies sent out for comment on TM 4-97;
13 May 97	Comments from agencies due back;
19 May 97	Public Works comments: few, save for median strip location at main entrance;
27 May 97	Development Review Committee (DRC) meeting: TM 4-97 approved with following conditions: storm drain improvements and public access to slough;
30 May 97	Public Hearing Notice: re, PURD/TM at Planning Commission Meeting of 12 June;
4 June 97	Letter from developer confirming DRC changes to project;
5 June 97	Developer resubmits revised map and development plan;
5 June 97	Staff report to Planning Commission prepared;
6 June 97	Affidavit of mailing for Public Hearing Notice;

California Department Housing and Community Development

12 June 97	Planning Commission Meeting: Staff report presented, recommending PURD 3-97 and TM 4-97; minimal conditions of approval adopted, including addition of masonry fence around project and settlement agreement for access to slough and bike path--minutes of meeting incredibly short--no public opposition to project presented. Planning Commission approves PURD and TM. Notice of Determination approved; No City Council action necessary due to consistency with zoning and EIR;
16 June 97	Notice of Determination filed with County Clerk based on EIR 2-88;
24 June 97	Planning Commission letter to developer approving project with Conditions of Approval;
24 June 97	PURD Permit with Conditions of Approval granted for project;
21 Oct 97	City Council passes/approves/adopts Resolution # 97-0400 approving final map;
Current	Project has been sold to new developer, Lewis Homes of Sacramento. Project currently in escrow. New house designs are being considered based on the approved tentative map. No Building Permits have been granted thus far.

Total Time for Approvals:

14 Apr 97 - 24 June 97 = 2.25 months, not including building permits

Public Participation / Opposition

No public opposition from neighbors or community groups was noted in the project files.